This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

A 411113

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI.
No. 12672 Section
Case Shelf

BR
50
.M68

THE

MISSOURI

CHRISTIAN LECTURES

SELECTED FROM THE COURSES OF

1889, 1890, AND 1891.

ST. LOUIS:
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1892.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
CHRISTIAN UNITY. *H. W. Everest.*	9
THE STANDARD OF APPEAL IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. *F. D. Power.*	35
RELATION OF CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE. *W. A. Oldham.*	64
WHO WROTE THE PENTATEUCH? *Geo. Plattenburg.*	84
REVELATION A DEVELOPMENT; ITS TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT PHASES. *B. C. Deweese.*	131
REVELATION A DEVELOPMENT; ITS TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT PHASES. *J. C. Reynolds.*	156
REVELATION A DEVELOPMENT; ITS TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT PHASES. *J. J. Haley.*	170
CHURCH GOVERNMENT. *J. W. McGarvey.*	188
THE LAW OF SPIRITUAL INTERACTION. *W. W. Hopkins.*	210
THE SUPERNATURAL AS THE GROUND OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF. *I. B. Grubbs.*	234
THE TERM "SEED" IN THE PROMISE TO ABRAHAM. *G. W. Longan.*	256
THE TWENTIETH CENTURY'S ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOSPEL TRUST. *Benj. L. Smith.*	288

PREFACE.

The projectors of this enterprise have lived to see it become a success. At times, as respects publication, they have been compelled to exercise patience, but it has been doing for them a good work. The purpose of the Missouri Christian Lectureship is now well known. It has afforded opportunity for creating and purifying thought as no other method known to us. The criticism that has been developed has helped every one of its attendants. Brethren have been brought together who were of different casts of mind, and in their assembly there has redounded both unity and peace. Extremes have met and melted into common dogma. Ventilation in spiritual matters has proved as salutary as in physical. Absolutely, it leaves no cause for the suspicions of the heresy-hunter. Annually he has a chance to hear, to criticise and to forbear, if he so desires. But, in hearing, it is notable, he becomes surprised at the number of thoughts he finds himself profitably reflecting upon—possibly endorsing.

We have found the Lectureship valuable as a method of settling thought upon practical measures. The church of the future, in all its bearings upon men, women and children, presents large fields for investigation. Some of these are already being occupied, and it seems pertinent, therefore, to have a better understanding of them. In our last course of lectures special attention was given to this by an able writer. The themes already selected for the next session have this in view. The committee is determined to do all in its power to bring valuable truths to the front.

As to the books published by the Lectureship, from time to

time, they must largely speak for themselves. In our judgment they do not suffer by contrast with other works of like import. To own the set, so far printed, is to own that which will vitalize and enfranchise the mind. No one, we think, can truthfully say less.

We come, then, before the public, asking for a generous patronage. Read one of these soul-stirring lectures, and then tell your neighbor about it so that he may honor the publishers with an order. We wish to dispose of a thousand copies of this edition. We need the money to meet our expenses and to promote the interests of the Lectureship, and we think the brotherhood will get its equivalent in the valuable discussions coming into its possession.

J. W. MONSER,
G. A. HOFFMANN,
W. G. SURBER,
Executive Committee.

MISSOURI CHRISTIAN LECTURES

CHRISTIAN UNITY.

H. W. EVEREST.

This lecture will deal with three things: the *Nature*, the *Divine Basis*, and the *Phases*, of Christian Unity:

I. *What do we mean by Christian Unity?* What is the nature of that oneness for which the Savior prayed, for which good men are pleading, and without which the world will not believe in Christ?

First of all, this Unity must be *Christian Unity*. The words *Christian Unity* draw the line at once between spurious and genuine unity, between those who are Christians and those who are not. It must be an *honest* union springing from the universal reception of fundamental truth, from a clear perception of what is essential to salvation, from loyalty to Christ, and from unfeigned love of the brethren. It must not be a show, a sham, a mere outward seeming. It must not be an unwilling union compelled by outward pressure, nor a compromise by the sacrifice of truth and conscience, nor a temporary truce between contending factions; but a real, organic, vital union resulting from a spiritual union with Christ and one another.

Again, this unity must be the unity of *those who are Christians*. It is assumed that the New Testament is clear and definite as to what constitutes a Christian;

not but that the Scriptures in this, as in other respects, may be distorted and misapplied, nor that blind ignorance, prejudice, and bigotry will always stumble upon the truth. It is here assumed and maintained that the Word of God, when placed in the light of a common sense and scientific exegesis, yields no equivocal answer to the question, What must I do to become a Christian? This assumption is justified by the fact that among those who take the Bible and the Bible alone as the supreme authority in religious matters, there is, in this respect, an essential agreement. The denial of this assumption renders the Bible absurd; since, if it is not a revelation on this vital subject, it need not be on any other; it also renders the question of Christian unity utterly absurd, since then Christians and non-Christians would be hopelessly intermingled and confounded.

If one denies that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God—the Son of God in the Bible sense—there can be no Christian union with him. He preaches a human Savior; he makes Jesus an impostor, a falsifier, and a deceiver. With Unitarians and all other broad-gauge, or narrow-gauge, self-styled Christians who deny the divinity of our Lord, Christian unity is impossible. Under this classification come Jews and Mahomedans, Agnostics and unbelievers of every grade. "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?"

Nor is Christian unity possible with one who,

though he may confess that the Christ has come in the flesh and that he was divine, has practically dethroned Christ by swearing allegiance to anti-Christian authority. This interdict applies to all true and intelligent Roman Catholics; for so far forth as a man is a Roman Catholic, he is not a Christian. Roman Catholicism is undoubtedly the Great Apostasy, "the man of sin," that "wicked one" whose coming was "after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders," and "whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." If one shall accord to the church, whether to the church in general, to the clergy, or to the supposed vicar of Christ, the right to say what is the Word of God and how it is to be understood; if he shall swear allegiance to the usurper who sits in the Vatican claiming to be "His Holiness" and the infallible earthly head of the church, he practically ignores the Bible and becomes a traitor to Christ.

Christian Unity excludes all those who refuse to bow to the authority of Jesus. Though one has been brought up in a Christian land and nurtured in a Christian home, though a pew-holder and a church-goer, though giving an intellectual assent to the religion of Christ and making Christian morals the rule of his life, and though a scholar and a gentleman, yet if he does not confess Christ and enter into his kingdom, he is not a Christian, but one the severity of whose condemnation will be in proportion to his knowledge.

It excludes those who come under the apostolic requirement to withdraw from all those who walk

disorderly, and concerning whom God says, "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate."

There will always be cranks and fanatics, apostates and heretics, and those who love the pre-eminence. We must draw the line somewhere, and we may as well draw it according to the Word of God and the facts in the case. This drawing the line will be painful to many charitable souls whose ideal of Christian unity is that of a conglomeration of all isms and practices, who would include every clever fellow and popular lady, and who would not be so impolite as to deny Christian obituary and burial to any respectable people. And yet we insist that one must be "born again" before he can see the kingdom of God; we insist that this unity shall be *Christian* unity. If we as a people who plead for unity are not orthodox and evangelical in the true sense; if we deny the Lord and are not loyal to him; if we do not bow to his authority nor walk worthy of our high calling, then *we also* are to be excluded, though we help to draw the line which cuts us off.

Second. This Christian unity must be a practical, working unity. There are those who seem not to see anything wrong in the divided state of the Protestant world; they call *this* Christian unity, and a full realization of the oneness for which the Savior prayed. In their view the different denominations are but so many brigades and regiments in the grand army of the Lord, marching under different banners, but fighting the common enemy. Now, we are thankful for the modicum of truth which this favorite illustration presents, but cannot fail to see that these brigades and regiments are mutually hostile, marching down

upon one another, sweeping their own ranks, right and left, with solid shot and bursting shell, making devils laugh and angels weep. They are under the delusion that when fighting one another they are fighting the battles of the Lord. There is no concert of action, no advancing the whole line, and an immense waste of life and treasure. If this is the Christian unity for which Jesus prayed, what, in the name of reason, is the state of division from which he would save us! If this is the way that God and Christ are united in saving men, is it any wonder that so many perish? Some, again, are praying for a quiet, secret, spiritual union which shall not disturb party lines. It is evident, however, that such a union will not meet the demands of the case. We need such a unity as shall be a sufficient antidote to the poison of division, party strife, sectarianism, hatred, and waste of time, men and money. We need a unity which shall help the world *to believe* in Christ; it must be spiritual and loving, but also visible, actual, organic and effective; and that it may be so there must be union in all fundamental doctrines, union in all divine ordinances, union in such an organization as will render possible combined and aggressive action at home and abroad, and union in such a spirit of love and confidence as shall enable the world to say, "Behold how these Christians love one another."

As a *third* means of definition, let it be said that this Christian unity must be a reproduction of the unity which characterized the apostolic church. Whatever God does is the result of infinite power, wisdom and goodness. Nature, therefore, is perfect, and we make progress by discovering and obeying her

laws, and not by disobeying them; so the church as it existed under the divine guidance given to the apostles was perfect, and we can make progress in religious affairs not by modifying the New Testament institutions and practices, but by restoring the ancient gospel and the ancient church. That church was perfect in all divine appointments. With a perfect knowledge of human nature, and of all the changes and necessities of the future, heaven constituted the church such as it was. The church is the product not only of infinite wisdom, but also of divine authority. There is no *authority* on earth to change its foundation, its ordinances, its laws, nor its basis of unity. There is no *need* of a change, since human nature and the divine character, time and eternity, are the same. We are not to modernize the church; we are not to invent new plans of union; we are not to hew out for ourselves cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water; but it is our duty rather to accept the church as heaven ordained it, and to believe with the utmost confidence that this course will lead to the best results. Where heaven speaks there is no room for human speculation; where God has wrought there is no place for human ingenuity. Your pet theory of Christian unity is an impertinence; so is mine, and so is that of every other man. It is not ours to ask how it *should* be, but rather to ask how it *is*, and how it is by divine authority.

II. This brings us to the second division of the subject under discussion, viz: *The Divine Basis of Christian Unity*. That such a basis has been given is a most important fact, and one worthy of careful study. The discovery of this fact will be a great

relief to those who have been racking their brains for a *plan*, and will remove the whole subject from the region of invention and experiment to that of authority, law and certainty.

First. In the apostolic church there was need of unity; this need was clearly seen and provided for. Various and hostile classes and nationalities were to be brought into loving and working harmony. Jews and Gentiles, for ages hating one another, not intermarrying, nor even eating together, were to be made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. The enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, was to be abolished; the middle wall of partition was to be broken down; and of the twain there was to be one new man, so making peace. There were questions of the law, of circumcision, of the Sabbath, and of daily intercourse, to be settled. There was need of patience, forbearance and mutual concession; there was need of kindly offices, as when the Gentiles sent alms and contributions, again and again, to the poor saints at Jerusalem. There were Jews and Samaritans so hostile that neither would give the other a cup of water; so hostile that it was almost a miracle if a Samaritan should give two pence to save a wounded and dying Jew. There were Greeks and barbarians, men and women, the rich and the poor, the bond and the free, all to be brought into the one Church of Christ. The question of unity was distinctly recognized; they sought to hasten the time when, in fact, as well as in theory, there should be neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but all should be one in Christ Jesus.

There was the same tendency to follow the leader-

ship of men then as now—a tendency rebuked and repressed. There was the same tendency to follow the *ignis fatuus* of vain philosophy; to be occupied with strivings about words to no profit; to give heed to fables and endless genealogies which minister questions rather than godly edifying; to be occupied with profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so-called.

If this is not enough to show that the question of unity was prominent in the minds of inspired men, we have, in addition, their abundant condemnation of divisions and their frequent exhortations to union. "For ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal? For while one saith I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" "Now, I beseech you, brethren, mark them who cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you; but that you be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment."

In the *second* place, let us see what this divine basis of unity was. It comprised three things: *organic* unity, *doctrinal* unity, and *spiritual* unity. In the language of Scripture, there was the one foundation, the bond of peace, and the bond of perfection.

Organic unity was secured by a common faith in Christ, by a common belief that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God. This was the central, fundamental, organic truth. Neither in earth nor heaven is there a

sublimer truth. It is the highest revelation of God, and it meets the deepest wants of man. Grant but this, and the whole Christian system must follow; then, holy men of old wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and the apostles spake as God gave them utterance; then, there is One who has power on earth to forgive sin, One who is the way, the truth and the life.

This proposition concerning Jesus was lifted into the greatest prominence. It was the subject of prophetic utterance, was announced by the Angel Gabriel, was sung to the listening shepherds, was proclaimed at the Baptism and the Transfiguration, was proved by prophecy and miracle, was confessed by the Savior before Pontius Pilate, was demonstrated by the resurrection of Jesus, was declared by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, was preached everywhere by the apostles, and was confirmed by the signs and miracles which accompanied their preaching. It is the one saving truth, the foundation of the church, and the hope of the world.

This proposition possesses organic power. As the life force organizes and builds the plant or animal; as the central political principle has organic force in the monarchy or republic; as the sun controls all the planets, so does this sublime truth vitalize and organize the church. Faith in Christ produces sorrow for the sins which nailed him to the cross, and love for him who tasted death for every man. Godly sorrow worketh repentance unto salvation, and repentance is followed by obedience to Him who has all authority in heaven and in earth.

Faith in Christ is the great bond of union. Jesus

declared that if lifted up he would draw all men unto him. He *was* lifted up, and he *is drawing* all men unto himself; "for we are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." The personal attraction of a mother may hold the family together; the personal power of Napoleon made his army well-nigh invincible; and so faith in the one blessed Lord must unite all his followers. We sit together at his feet; we bow together around his cross; we stand together gazing into the heavens whence he shall come again, and we listen to the voice of the one Captain of our Salvation. Like the attraction of the sun, love for Christ must override and subordinate all other influences. Does a man believe in and love our Lord, then wherever I meet him, at home or in heathen lands, of whatever race or color, and however ignorant and poor, he is my brother, and I give him freely my hand and my heart. Let all earthly lights be lost in the radiance of the Son of God; let all other trust be forgotten in the memory of Jesus and his love!

Doctrinal unity was secured by the bond of peace. An apostolic deliverance determines the maximum and the minimum limits of doctrinal oneness. "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

The one *body* forbids formulas of doctrine made to serve as foundations of new organizations; forbids the leadership of men in religious matters; forbids the segregation of the friends of Jesus into parties and denominations; and forbids those party names

which must needs be, if parties are to be. It requires that all those differences which may co-exist with Christian worthiness shall be tolerated in the same body. It allows individual liberty where this divine basis of doctrinal unity does not bind us; and the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free is quite as necessary as the unity. Nor is this toleration impossible, for we often find greater differences between members of the same church than between the different churches, only these individual differences have not yet been builded into party walls.

The one *Spirit* is the one Holy Spirit; the spirit of Christ, animating the one body. The one *Hope* is the hope of salvation, the hope to which we are begotten by the resurrection of Christ, the hope which is like an anchor to the soul, sure and steadfast. These three things go far in promoting that outward unity which would impress the world and lead to belief in Christ.

This outward unity is grounded in the next trinity of doctrines, a trinity as inseparable as that of Father, Son and Holy Spirit; the one *Lord*, the one *faith*, and the one *baptism;* the one Lord Jesus Christ, whose commands are to be obeyed; the one faith in him as the Messiah, the Son of God; and the one *baptism* into him, the one translation from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son. This one baptism evidently is the baptism in water which Christ and his apostles enjoin and which the preacher administers. Long ago the twelve disciples at Ephesus learned that John's baptism had passed away. While the gift of the Spirit remains and is given to every obedient believer, the gifts of the Spirit

are no longer conferred by the laying on of apostolic hands; nor is there now any baptism in the Holy Spirit manifesting itself by the sound of a rushing, mighty wind, by tongues of flame, and by miraculous speech. There is but *one* baptism.

These three things imply more than may, at first, be seen; that we recognize the supreme authority of Jesus, and accept him as our prophet, priest and king; that we recognize the authority of his apostles to whom he gave inspiration and miraculous power, and who sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel; that we bow to apostolic precept and precedent as we do to the words of Jesus who said to them, "Whosoever heareth you, heareth me; and whosoever heareth me, heareth him that sent me." It forbids us to accept any other authority in the Church of Christ, whether tradition or science, pope or council. Much of our trouble arises from the fact that, as the Jews are still wearing a vail over their faces so that they cannot see the glory of Christ, so the Protestant world is still under the shadow of the Great Apostasy. There is a strong tendency to go back to the flesh-pots of popery; to the Easter Sundays and Good Fridays; to the altars, the robes, and the tiaras, to the priesthoods, the bishoprics, and the cardinals' thrones; and to be governed quite as much by the "man of sin" as by the Lord Jesus.

The seventh item in this doctrinal basis of unity declares that all else is subordinate to the one God who is above all.

Spiritual unity was secured by that love which is the bond of perfectness, and without which we are not reconciled to God and are nothing in his sight.

This divine basis of unity is beautifully illustrated when we regard the church as the temple of God. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Persons well taught, and truly converted—the gold, silver and precious stones—are the living stones laid upon this foundation and firmly held to their places by faith in Christ and love for him. These living stones are bound to one another by the seven bonds of doctrinal unity, while the whole is cemented into a solid structure by love, which is the bond of a perfect union. It is a homogeneous and a glorious edifice; a divine Person is the foundation, converted men and women constitute the living walls, and the whole grows into a holy temple, a habitation of God through the Spirit.

Still keeping the basis of unity before us, let us in the *third* place consider whether this Bible basis commends itself to our enlightened reason. It may help us if we can see that this basis can not be improved upon.

1. Notice its *simplicity*. Primitive Christianity, and indeed any religion that meets the wants of all men, needed to be simple in its elements and commands. It was for all nations, however wise and however rude and ignorant. If a man or child knows enough to sin and need a Savior, he knows enough to be saved. The faith of a child may be as implicit and its obedience as acceptable as that of a philosopher. The gospel was preached, prompt obedience was enjoined, and then the school of Christ was open to every disciple. There was no metaphysical analysis of spiritual experience, of which so few are capable. Confession and baptism were proofs of acceptable

faith and repentance, and the Word of God was the evidence of pardon. Converts were not received to doubtful disputation. As babes in Christ, they were not required to sit in judgment on long creeds written out by doctors of divinity, and thus to select their life-long religious homes; nor were the lambs kept out of the fold six months to see whether they would live or die. Accordingly, the basis of unity was equally simple, including only what was necessary to make and keep a man a Christian.

2. Notice the *brevity* of this basis. If all Christians are to unite, the basis must be brief and comprehensive; there must be large room for liberty of opinion and differences of religious growth. If one believed with all his heart that Jesus was the Christ, and a divine Savior, that was enough to begin with. That he might keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, how few the points of essential agreement! And but one principle, that of divine love, was to hold men loyal to Christ and to one another.

3. Again, this basis was *sufficient*. Nothing can be added or taken away without marring it. Anything taken away would be like removing the key-stone of an arch, and anything added would exclude some portion of Christ's followers. Take out the one Lord, and there will remain no one authority. Add Calvinism or Arminianism, or any single doctrine peculiar to either, and immediately large numbers begin to march out of the union.

4. Once more, this basis was *practical;* it had a direct bearing, not on speculative theology, but on Christian growth and work. Each item presents a truth or matter of fact, and not an opinion. Each

item presents what is essential and productive of unity in action. It is *present* truth rather than something far away in the past or the future. Adam will tell us all about the "fall" when we see him; and rather than divide over the interpretation of some prophecy we can await the events themselves. Every item looks toward unity in spirit and work. And this, after all, is the main thing; let us not differ about the cause of the storm when wrecks are drifting on the shore, and men are struggling amid the breakers. We must forego many interesting questions for the sake of harmony and success in Christian work.

In the *fourth* place and finally, in respect to the divine basis of unity, what success attended those primitive efforts to secure and maintain Christian unity. The necessity was great, and though the difficulties were many, the success was complete. There was but one body. In no city or country were there rival Christian sects. No creeds were written out. There was no "discipline" but the gospel and the apostles' letters. No apostle or evangelist gave his name to a religious party. There was not a Pauline and a Petrine gospel, but all spoke the same things and were of the same mind. The result of this perfect unity of spirit and work was most marvelous. In the face of all opposition—the hostility of all false religions leagued with the civil powers, the opposition of sinful human nature itself, and the combined persecution of the Jewish and Gentile worlds,—in less than three centuries the Nazarene had conquered the whole Roman Empire. Neither then nor now could anything successfully withstand the gospel of Christ, sustained and propagated by a united church.

III. Having defined the unity desired and its divine basis, let us next consider some *phases* of this unity, or its relations to creed and sect, to growth and work.

1. The relation of Christian unity to the will of Heaven can not, for a moment, be in doubt. We know that all Heaven would rejoice over the realization of perfect union. God commands it; Jesus prayed for it, and this is still his prayer; as "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him might not perish but have everlasting life," he must be grieved at the want of that oneness which would help men to believe; he must be deeply grieved when his people spend money, time and power in opposing one another; the angels who minister to the heirs of salvation must bewail these wretched divisions and alienations; while every dying heathen, every perishing infidel, is an appeal echoed back from heaven, and which good men can not refuse to hear.

2. The relation of this unity to the growing skepticism and opposition is evident. Many have believed the time would come when the denominations of Protestantism would be compelled to unite. That time *has* come. Never before were such efforts made and in so many ways to destroy the Christian faith. It comes from without and from within; it comes from the oracles of science and from historic criticism; it comes in poetry and prose, in fact and fiction; it comes in bold and brazen blasphemy and in the mask of piety and Christian morals; it comes from old sources and whence it was least expected; it comes in argument and sheer assumption; in ridicule

and in shouts of victory. If the time for union has not already come, then it never will come. Besides meeting and defeating our foes in argument, we must increase every other Christian influence. We must present a united front with solid columns pressing on behind. The union of the enemies of Christ must cause the union of his friends. As in our Revolutionary War they hailed the cruelty of Tory and Briton as the means of kindling the fires of patriotism, so we could almost welcome the bitterest opposition, if it would only unite all denominations and turn them against the common foe.

3. And what would be the relation of this Christian unity to the creeds of Christendom? Could all the Christian sects of the Protestant world unite upon this basis without the sacrifice of truth or conscience? The longer the creeds, the more points they contain, the more numerous the differences and divisions, and the more need of new creeds to explain and determine the former creeds. Would it be well to carry this process still further? Would it be well for each of the thousand-and-one denominations to split up into a score of minor divisions? If this would not be approved, then neither is the present state of the church what it should be. If it is much desired to unite all Methodists into one body, and all Baptists and all Presbyterians, then would it not be still better to unite all Evangelical denominations into the one body of Christ? Is it not about time to reverse the process which has led to division and party strife, and begin to cut the creeds down? Cut off the last addition, the New Theology, with its post-mortem gospel and its logical putting over of all mission work

till the good time coming in Hades. Cut off Adventism, with its speculations about the unconscious dead, annihilation, recreation, and the punishing of the generations past, in the persons of those who never lived before. If the dead are conscious, we shall know it; and if unconscious we shall *never* know it, and all the rest we shall know in due time. Next, cut off Universalism, which refuses to obey God because it claims to have discovered that men will not be punished eternally if they do not. Cut off eternal election and the equally arbitrary present Spirit election, and let "every man save himself from this untoward generation." Cut off all human additions, whether true or false, till we come down to the divine creed and the divine basis of union. Is there any one who would sacrifice truth or conscience by accepting the divine plan? Supreme allegiance to Christ manifested by the good confession and obedience to him—would any one dissent and refuse this the highest place? The one body—would any one think union wrong in itself? The one Holy Spirit dwelling with all Christians—would anyone repudiate it? The one hope—does not every Christian cherish it? The one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Father over all—does any one object? No, not even to the one baptism, for there is a form of baptism which all accept, and, in respect to its design, all agree that it is a command which must be obeyed. Would all this require any sacrifice of principle? Certainly not. And on the other hand, if one agrees and conforms to all this, could any one justly refuse him Christian recognition and brotherhood? Most certainly not. The constitution of the United States does not contain all that the people know, and

so the creed need not contain all religious knowledge, but only what is essential to these things: *Obedience to Christ, Christian character, and Christian work.* Let us not refuse recognition of our brother because he knows, or thinks he knows, less or more than we do. Let us leave some things to be decided by the revelations of the last day.

4. A fourth phase of unity is its outlook toward denominational organizations. Is the plan practicable in these days? Take an average village with eight or ten churches, and can it be shown that, if all are anxious for union, they can unite on the Bible plan? If they cannot, then union, in these days, is impossible, and Jesus prayed without a clear understanding of the stubborn facts in the case.

First, there would need to be a giving up of all allegiance to party organizations and names, that nothing might be in the way.

Second, there would need to be an earnest spirit of concession, and of prayer for the union of God's people; a ten days' prayer-meeting might be necessary to break up the fallow ground and get rid of the old leaven of sectism.

Third, there should be an effort to reproduce the apostolic church in every element of divine appointment; and, in order to this, there should be a careful study of the New Testament in the same spirit and by the same rules.

Fourth, it should be required that every one should make the "good confession;" that is, a public confession of faith in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.

Fifth, it should be required that every one should

do the things requisite to constitute him a Christian—faith, repentance, confession, calling on the name of the Lord, baptism—for this is an effort to reproduce *Christian* unity.

Sixth, they should continue steadfast in the apostles' doctrine, in the partnership, in breaking bread, and in prayers; that is, they should reproduce and maintain the ordinances and the worship of the ancient church.

Seventh, they should adopt the church government and the officers of that divinely organized and Apostolic Church.

And *Eighth*, they should accept the "bond of peace" as given in the fourth of Ephesians, without addition or subtraction.

Yes, I know that, just at this point in the discussion, objections are impatient to be heard; but these objections may all be fairly summed up in the one statement that the Protestant denominations cannot agree in respect to what the apostolic church was. It must be admitted that to whatever degree this statement can be made good, to that degree will Christian unity be difficult of achievement. Let us not shut our eyes to this difficulty, but carefully consider how much it means.

The logician can not be asked to prove all his premises, for this would require an infinite regression of proofs. He must begin with undemonstrable, admitted, axiomatic truth. You must grant the mathematician his definitions, postulates and axioms, or he cannot take a single step. So in religious matters, we must have a beginning place. The Catholic begins with an infallible Pope and church. The

Protestant begins with the Bible as the Word of God. The Protestant assumes that the New Testament is an inspired volume, that it is not ambiguous nor self-contradictory, and therefore that it can be, and ought to be, understood. Now, I stand by this assumption, and maintain that all Evangelical Protestants *can agree* in regard to this basis of union, and that *there is*, substantially, an agreement. I cannot consent that essential Bible truth cannot be reached, that the Scriptures are but a musical staff on which any tune can be written.

This agreement is possible, if we shall endeavor to arrive at the sense of Scripture through the application of the same rules. The Bible facts are the same for all; and if the same rules are applied, the same results will follow. The more intelligently and scientifically the Bible is studied the more perfect the agreement.

Again, when the question turns upon the teaching of the New Testament, and not on what *we* may think best and allowable, there is usually a unanimous verdict; for example, it is universally admitted by all who have a right to be heard, that New Testament baptism was that of penitent believers, and that it was an immersion. It is admitted that if one shall believe in Christ with all his heart, shall repent in the true sense, shall confess Christ before men, and shall be baptized, calling on the name of the Lord, he is a Christian according to New Testament teaching and practice. I have been longing for a debate with some honest, able man who will affirm the negative of this position; but, of course, there will be no such debate. It is admitted that the only ordinances of that ancient

church were the Lord's day and the Lord's supper. Nor is there any difference about the *facts* of church government. There was no ecclesiastical hierarchy then. The officers were deacons, elders and evangelists; and the congregation had the right to choose these and, through them, to administer the affairs of the church. Of course, there are men who have theories and arguments, and worldly ends to gain. There is a Wilford Hall who maintains that the scientific theory of sound is exceedingly *unsound*, and there are others, both in Europe and America, who deny the revolution of the earth on its axis; and yet the great men of science are not alarmed, and the earth does not pause in its diurnal revolutions; and, so, all Bible scholars know that what I have said about this common understanding of the New Testament is substantially true.

If it shall still be said that this basis is not adequate, nor this answer to objections satisfactory, two additional remarks will be allowed: *first*, we can not present any other than what we regard as the Bible basis of union, and if difficulties yet remain, they may be removed by a better understanding of this basis and a better application to existing conditions. *Second*, if large portions of the Protestant world should not unite on this basis, possibly this can not be helped. If one denies our Lord, he is without and will stand without at the last day. If one refuses to obey the Lord, it is better that he be taught and warned, rather than received in his disobedience. There always will be cranks, heretics, and sectarians who will never come into any sort of Christian union.

5. A fifth phase of Christian unity relates to the

home work of the church. If all Protestant denominations could unite, the effect for good on home work would be incalculable. Capital would be saved, since there need be but one church-building where now there are ten; salaries would be saved, or nine-tenths of the preachers could go to heathen lands. Emphasis could then be laid upon saving truth and not on useless opinions. Multitudes gathered in one place would draw other multitudes, and the gospel could be proclaimed with unusual zeal and success.

In many a New England village and western city, with a dozen meeting-houses and churches, they have no pastors and no religious services. They are often so poor as to be unable to have a prayer-meeting or a respectable funeral. Division makes these weak churches an easy prey, while union would make them strong and victorious.

6. Once more, Christian unity sustains important relations to missionary work. With the same zeal in the foreign work as now, the money would increase from ten to one hundred millions annually, and the missionaries from forty thousand to four hundred thousand; but with the increased zeal and the increased membership which union would give at home, there would be a still greater increase in all foreign fields. There would be an end to the shameful oppositions among missionaries. If one denomination, after years of begging at home and of privation and danger abroad, had gained a few heathen to their cause, some other denomination would not spend half a million to reconvert them. These missionaries would find the opposition of heathen religions sufficient and would not make war

on one another. The *Christian hindrances* to missionary success in Jamaica, Turkey, Japan, India and wherever the fields of work have not been fenced off, are scandalous in the extreme, not to use the epithets which such conduct deserves, and it is not one whit less wicked at home than it is abroad. Sectarianism threatens to utterly ruin all missionary work. Is it for this that children give their pennies, widows tearfully cast in their mites, their all, and that dying saints bequeath their estates? Are prayers, sermons, and missionary conclaves all a solemn mockery, and an insult to heaven? Oh, if no where else, may the union movement begin in Japan or China and, like a great tidal wave, may it sweep round the world!

The problem of Christian unity is now before us; its nature, the importance of its solution, and its difficulties. Is there a divine basis of unity? and what, as individuals and Christian communities, is our duty in the premises?

1. All Christians should continually join in the Savior's prayer that they all may be one and that the world may believe that God hath sent him.

2. Every Christian man should see to it that he does not stand in the way of this unity. He should be willing to abandon creed, party, life-long customs, anything and everything, that conscience will allow, that this unity may be consummated. Who would share the guilt of this wrong against perishing millions, of this sin against high heaven? "Who can understand his errors?" "keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins."

3. Every Christian community should form the same resolution; "God helping us, we will not stand

in the way, but will promote Bible unity by every proper means." As a people, the Disciples of Christ, now seven or eight hundred thousand strong, have been trying to do this. We have constantly made this plea for unity; for unity on Bible ground, and through a restoration of the apostolic church. We have not asked the people to come to us, but rather to gather around the cross. We may have done this with too much sectarian zeal. If we are wrong in theory or in practice, may God help, and not permit us to hinder his glorious coming.

4. It is the duty of all Christians to study this question of unity; and especially to study it in the light of the holy Scriptures. Let us study to agree rather than to differ, and to see how much more important is the great sun which gives heat and light and life to all, than the fire-flies which only serve to reveal the darkness of the summer night.

5. Let the different denominations meet on common ground whenever and wherever they can. If we unite whenever we can, we may see our way to more perfect union. Let us worship together frequently and constantly, in the prayer-meeting, in the Lord's day service, and by an exchange of congregations and preachers. Let us continue to keep step to the world-wide Sunday-school movement. Let our young people learn to work together in the Young Men's Christian Association, and in the societies of Christian Endeavor. Let us work together in the temperance cause, and stand together for good government. Let us rejoice together over the success of the gospel, and sorrow over its failures, but most of all that it fails to unite us in the service of our Master.

6. Nor should we labor for Christian unity without hope of success. There are many hopeful signs. The prayer of Jesus must be answered. Reforms are now accomplished in decades, not centuries. The resources of Providence are wonderful, and in ways which we cannot now forecast nor understand God will bring it to pass.

THE STANDARD OF APPEAL IN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

F. D. POWER.

The one final standard of appeal in religious thought is Christ and his teaching. The Teacher sent from God, who spoke as never man spoke, who alone hath the words of eternal life, in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, to whom is given all authority in heaven and in earth, and who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption, is the last arbiter whose decision we may invoke in all things pertaining to his kingdom. Standing before Festus in the judgment hall at Cæsarea, Paul answered his accusers with the words, *Cæsaream appello!*—"I appeal unto Cæsar." This put an end to all controversy and to all further jurisdiction in the case on the part of the procurator. Cæsar represented the incarnation of Roman law. The imperial court at Rome was the supreme tribunal. For all the world and on all questions of justice this was the ultimate recourse. Christ is the one imperial lawgiver and judge on all questions of faith and practice in religion. Christ's teaching furnishes the last test of the genuineness and virtue of religious truth. *Christum appello!*—"I appeal unto Christ,"—brings every question touching the feelings and actions of men in their relation to God to the final proof.

There can be no other standard. To the Pope of Rome has been ascribed this distinction. At the instigation of the Empress of France, during the occupancy of the papal chair by Pius IX., a man weak in character, unversed in theological learning, holding highest views of his prerogatives and eager to exalt them, the Vatican Council of December 1869, by its great majority of Italian, bishops decreed that the Roman Pontiff when speaking *ex cathedra* is endowed "with that infallibility with which our divine Redeemer willed that the church should be furnished in defining the doctrine of faith or morals." After protracted sittings for seven months, and most discreditable political methods to break the force of the minority, this was carried by the ultramontane influence, with eighty-eight members of the Council, representing really the brain and body of Catholicism, dissenting, sixty-two voting with the understanding it should be modified, and ninety not voting at all. It is fair to say Rome herself does not accept this dogma literally, the *consensus* of mankind could never accede to it, and, if history be interpreted as the finger of God, Heaven itself frowned upon it, as the very day it was promulgated Napoleon III. proclaimed war against Prussia and entered upon the great conflict, among the immediate results of which was the overthrow of the temporal power of the Papacy and the occupation of Rome by the troops of the Italian King in two months' time from the last meeting of the Council.

Nor do the claims of the church as an organization to such authority rest upon any better grounds. The Church is the body of which Christ is the head. With

all her fathers, councils and courts, she is but the creature, the servant, of which Christ is the Creator and Lord. No power is delegated to her to set forth a *regula fidei*, a criterion of Christian doctrine. For the whole body, as for each individual member, there is one perfect code of law which is a test of all other legislation, and the doctrine that the Church may decree a rule of faith takes away Christ and puts in his place an ecclesiastical corporation.

Much less can tradition be taken as a test of religious thought. Tradition has ever been used to give currency to human opinions and regulations; its foundations are sandy and unsafe, and whatever its value as a source of speculative information, it can never be a sure and reliable standard in matters of religion. The declaration of the Council of Trent that the Word of God includes the Scriptures and tradition, and Cardinal Manning's position that tradition is the supreme interpreter of Scripture, and that this tradition is maintained only by the Church of Rome, of which the Pope is the head and exponent, breaks down all distinction between the human and the divine, and tends to subordinate the Bible to tradition and to make Rome the infallible judge of truth.

Least of all can conscience, reason, or the "inner light" be regarded as a final arbiter by which we may pass judgment upon all religious teaching as by a universal touchstone. Conscience is the crowning faculty in man. It is a moral sense by which we recognize the difference between right and wrong. It instructs, arbitrates, directs. But conscience is universal. Whose conscience? whose reason? whose inner light is to be the supreme rule? Shall it be that of

the pagan, the infidel, the Jew, or the Christian? the educated or the uneducated? Plainly here is not the standard; if so, every man may go his own way and there can be no unity of faith among men.

The one last appeal in religious thought is to Christ and his teaching. To the truth of this position there is abundant testimony. Let us call the witnesses. First, unbelief itself bears testimony. As far as there can be any criterion in matters beyond the decision of sense the infidel will grant to Christ and his doctrine the crowning place. Hear Goethe: "I esteem the Gospels to be thoroughly genuine, for there shines forth from them the reflected splendor of a sublimity, proceeding from the person of Jesus Christ, of so divine a kind as only the divine could have manifested upon earth." Listen to Rousseau: "How petty are the books of the philosophers with all their pomp compared with the Gospels! Can it be that writings at once so sublime and so simple are the work of men? Can he whose life they tell be no more than a mere man? Is there anything in his character of the enthusiast or of the ambitious sectary? What sweetness! What purity in his ways! What touching grace in his teachings! What a loftiness in his maxims! What profound wisdom in his words! What an empire over his passions! Men do not invent like this, and the facts respecting Socrates, which no one doubts, are not so well attested as those about Jesus Christ. These Jews could never have struck this tone or thought of this morality, and the Gospel has characteristics of truthfulness so grand, so striking, so perfectly inimitable that their inventors would be even more wonderful than he whom they portray. Yes; if

the death of Socrates be that of a sage, the life and death of Jesus are those of a God." Bring John Stuart Mill to the witness stand: "Whatever else may be taken away from us by rational criticism, Christ is still left; a unique figure, not more unlike all his precursors than all his followers, even those who had the direct benefit of his personal teaching. It is of no use to say that Christ, as exhibited in the Gospels, is not historical, and that we know not how much that is admirable has been superadded by the tradition of his followers. The tradition of his followers suffices to insert any number of marvels and may have inserted all the miracles he is reputed to have wrought, but who among the disciples or among their proselytes was capable of inserting the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? It remains a possibility that Christ actually was what he supposed himself to be—a man charged with a special, express and unique commission from God to lead mankind to truth and virtue." Hear the witness of Renan: "A thousand times more alive, a thousand times more beloved since thy death than during thy passage here below, thou shalt become the corner-stone of humanity so entirely, that to tear thy name from this world would be to rend it to its foundations! Between thee and God there would be no longer any distinction! All ages will proclaim that among the sons of men no one has been born who is greater than Jesus." Even Dr. Martineau, in his grossly infidel and illogical work on "The Seat of Authority in Religion," giving the "rule for separating the divine from the human in the origin of our religion" declares: "The former will be found,

if anywhere, in what Jesus of Nazareth *himself was*, in spirit, character, and moral relation to God. The latter will be found in what was *thought about* his person, functions, and office. It was the Providence of history that gave us *him;* it was the men of history that dressed up the theory of him, and until we compel the latter to stand aside and let us through to look upon his living face we can never see the permanent essence of the gift."

If Christ then be wisest, holiest, highest of teachers and of examples in the sphere of morality and religion, according to the concessions of unbelief, even skeptics will allow there can be no higher standard of appeal in religious thought. In taking the testimony of men to the truth of this position I do not summon Shakespeare, with his five hundred and fifty Bible allusions and quotations, where, in passage after passage, the greatest intellect known does lowly reverence to Jesus Christ. I need not call Galileo, Kepler, Newton, Bacon, Milton, Gladstone. I am content in this class of witnesses to take the word of his enemies.

Secondly. History and human experience declare the truth of this position. Who has been the uplifting force of the centuries? Where is the universal solvent of all our social problems? What has done more, immeasurably more, than all literature and philosophy to raise the standard of morals, to overthrow the lawless passions of men, to render the home sacred, to establish the ethics of the marriage relation, to suppress war in the earth, to make age reverenced, infancy regarded, manhood respected, womanhood honored, human life precious, and to carry light into the dark places and to unify the whole race of man?

What is the answer of history and of the experience of men? "Whatever defects and imperfections may attach to a few points of doctrine in the system of Calvinism," says James Russell Lowell, "it will be found that Calvinism, or any other ism which claims an open Bible and proclaims a crucified Christ, is infinitely preferable to any form of polite and polished skepticism which gathers as its votaries the degenerate sons of heroic ancestors who, having been trained in a society and educated in schools, the foundations of which were laid by men of faith and piety, now turn and kick down the ladder by which they have climbed up, and persuade men to live without God, and leave them to die without hope. The worst kind of religion is no religion at all, and these men, living in ease and luxury, indulging themselves in the amusement of going without religion, may be thankful that they live in lands where the gospel they neglect has tamed the beastliness and ferocity of the men who, but for Christianity, might long ago have eaten their carcasses like the South Sea Islanders, or cut off their heads and tanned their hides like the monsters of the French Revolution." In all human experience there are three tests of religious truth: in circumstances, utility; in character, beauty; in consciousness, happiness. Apply these to the religion of Christ and it triumphantly bears them. Christianity in action is its own defense. "There," said Hume, pointing to a pious man, "there goes one argument in favor of Christianity which I confess myself unable to answer." And what is the highest expression of Christianity? The Christ. "What is the shortest argument for the truth of the Christian religion?" demanded Frederick

the Great of his chaplain. "The Jews, your Majesty." What is the best? we ask. The Christ. If I know the Christ, it is nothing if I be ignorant of many things; if I know many things, and yet remain ignorant of the Christ, it is nothing. If I believe in Christ I may refuse to believe in many things; if I believe in many things, withholding my trust from Christ, it is nothing. The logic of one life among men, the logic of millions of lives transformed by that one life, proves the system. The practical experience of mankind, then, bears testimony that Christ and his teaching may be the standard of appeal in religious thought, as they are the noblest criterion of religious practice.

Furthermore, conscience approves of this test. Conscience is the reason employed about questions of right and wrong. Paul sought by the manifestation of truth to commend himself to every man's conscience in the fear of God. Tertullian appeals to this secret judgment: "Stand forth, O soul, whether thou art a divine and eternal substance, or whether thou art the very opposite of divine because indeed a mortal thing; stand forth to give thy witness!" What answer comes. It has been credited with a seven-fold testimony. Conscience with universal voice testifies to the fact of sin; suggests that death is a mark of God's displeasure; tells us we can not go before God in peace without a peacemaker. Conscience declares the light of nature insufficient for our guidance. The heavens declare the glory of God, but they do not tell of the pardon of sin. The stars do not answer the question, "What must I do to be saved?" The roses do not indicate man's origin or destiny. Athens, at the summit of philosophy, raises an altar to the Unknown

God. Rome in the golden age of reason turns to the entrails of beasts and to the flight of birds to learn the will of Heaven. Socrates, the prince of Pagan sages, dying, can perform no higher act of worship than to offer a cock to Æsculapius. Stuart Mill, the apostle of Agnosticism, takes his wife, in whom he saw "truth with no mixture of error," as the standard by which to regulate his life. Conscience attests the excellency of the Holy Scriptures. That the words of the Lord are pure words, that this is a holy volume, that its tendency is to make men better and happier, that it holds truths of unutterable value, that its instructions universally obeyed would present a scene of purity, peace and prosperity such as the world has never yet known is the testimony of this monitor. Conscience bears witness to the claims of Christ as a teacher sent from God. It led the woman of Samaria to cry to her town people: "Come, see a man which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?" It made Peter feel that he was in contact with a holy being and led him to exclaim: "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord!" It drove the scribes and Pharisees from his presence when, as he wrote upon the sand, he said of the woman taken in adultery: "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her." It caused the band that came to apprehend him in the garden to be awestruck as they approached him so that they went backward and fell upon the ground; and it moved Pilate to take water and wash his hands, saying, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person; see ye to it." It finds no higher philosophy. It can not account for Jesus of Nazareth as an invention of the Galileans. It can explain Christ

only on the ground that he was a divine teacher. Conscience teaches the necessity of an atonement. The Jews crowded to their altars with offerings. Pagan peoples have brought the beasts of the field and even human sacrifices to the shrines of religion. Why? Conscience drives them to it. Sin is a burden. But in these sacrifices there was remembrance of sin every year, while looking to Christ it sees a Mediator who, being the brightness of God's glory and the express image of his person, hath perfected forever them that are sanctified, and its peace is perfect and abiding. So conscience bears witness also that this Savior must be divine. A human Christ does not satisfy it. Only an Omnipotent Intercessor can blot out all offenses. No human creature, no angelic being, no system of opinions about Christ, no creed, no church, no declaration of principles, but the Christ—personal, living, omnipotent, divine, alone gives peace.

Conscience attests lastly, not only that Christ pacifies, but that his gospel rectifies, sanctifies and sustains the soul. Did it not convert the murderers of Jesus into his friends, revolutionize their purposes and practices? Did it not work in Corinth and in Rome vast changes when darkness covered the earth and gross darkness the people? Has it not clothed millions in their right minds and made whole races of heathen savages to wear the white garments of purity and love? Did it not keep the men who came saying, "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou alone hast the words of Eternal Life?" Has it not supported thousands on the scaffold and at the stake? Did it not make Paul mighty before kings? Luther before the Emperor? Knox in the galleys? Latimer and Ridley

in the flames? Have not men everywhere, oppressed with the Welt-Schmerz—the world sorrow,—or consciousness of burden and mystery of human suffering which has afflicted so many thinkers, from the writer of Ecclesiastes to Schopenhauer and Leopardi, found rest here? Conscience testifies to the truth of all this and witnesses to the power of Christ and the excellency of his doctrine. Conscience, reason, the "inner light," recognizes no loftier standard to which we may appeal.

Finally, this is the testimony of revelation. It was the word of Moses: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet of thy brethren, like unto me. Him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." It is the declaration of the prophets: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." It is the claim of Christ himself: "All things are delivered to me of my Father, and no man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him." "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." It is the witness of the Apostles: "He is before all things and by him all things consist: He is the head of the body, the church, which is the beginning, the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every

knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

So, then, to Christ we must appeal in all questions of faith and practice in religion. He is Counsellor. He is King. He is Judge. He is Legislator. He is Wisdom. He is the Truth. He rules and guides the ages, and he alone hath the words of Eternal Life.

What, then, is understood by Christ and his teaching? Turn to a scene in the life of the Messiah. The greatest glories come to men who pray. On one of the spurs of Hermon Jesus and three of his disciples find a quiet retreat for prayer. While resting in this retired spot a great change comes over the person of the Teacher. The fullness of the Godhead which dwelt bodily in him shone forth through his human nature as the streaming lights of a palace from its windows, and manifested not only the divinity which Peter had before confessed, but also the glorious resurrection body. Like the dazzling brightness of the sun his face kindled, and as the glittering snow on the peaks above him his garments shone. But this is not all. Rising before their vision, on either side of Christ is a noble figure. Their eyes are unveiled and they discern these spiritual beings. The mysterious faces framed in the thin mountain air are recognized: Elijah, translated nine hundred years before; Moses, gathered to his fathers fourteen centuries back in the past—the founder and the defender of the Old Dispensation, have come to do homage to Jesus Christ, and to surrender their authority into his hands. But this is not all. As Peter in his bewilderment exclaims:

"Lord, it is good for us to be here. It is glorious to be in such company as this. We would dwell forever here on this mountain height. We would have endless fellowship with these noble spirits. Let us detain them. Let us construct three tents and abide together,"—at that very moment a radiant cloud gathers in the heavens, envelopes the mountain and enwraps them in its bright folds, and a voice comes from the celestial glory, saying, "This is my beloved Son. Hear ye him!" It is as though God had said: Moses stands as the representative of the old economy, with its ceremonies and sacrifices. The law is passed. You are no longer under Moses. Elijah stands as the representative of a long line of Jewish prophets. The prophecies are fulfilled. You are no longer to hear Elijah. Behold my Son! Both Moses and Elijah must give place to him. He is now the Way, the Truth and the Life; no man cometh to the Father but by him. Hear the Living Voice of the unseen God.

This scene we call the Transfiguration. The religious world has not grasped its meaning. What signifies this command? Why, that all authority is given unto Christ in heaven and on earth; that the whole obligation of the Christian is exhausted in doing what Christ commands; that Moses and his law retire now before the presence of a greater Lawgiver and a higher law, as the stars fade before the sun; that Elijah and the prophets are to give place to a nobler witness and a loftier authority, to the one who is Prophet, Priest and King; that the world is no longer to hear Moses as supreme, or the prophets as the authoritative interpreters of the divine will, but Jesus Christ, the end of the law and the fulfilment of the prophecies, the

Messiah of Israel, King of kings, and Lord of lords, and Prophet of prophets, Author and Founder of the spiritual and material universe, is henceforh alone to be heard.

> "God hath now sent his living Oracle
> Into the world to teach his final will."

We do not understand that Christ speaks upon all questions, but upon questions of duty to God, as Moses spake and the prophets. We do not claim Christ and his teaching to be the standard of appeal in all thought, but in religious thought, and religious thought, as all thought, has its limitations. Men may propound problems, but who shall answer? "I can call spirits from the vasty deep," says Glendower. "Why, so can I," says Hotspur, "or so can any man, but will they come when you do call for them?" There are many things unfathomable to the most far-reaching intellect—things higher than the heavens, deeper than the earth, broader than the sea. Reason and revelation must alike say, "Now we know in part and prophesy in part." But while all the questionings of the human spirit may not find answer when Jesus speaks, his teaching covers all essential knowledge of divine things.

It is not limited to the Sermon on the Mount. No age has ever paralleled the wisdom of that single discourse from the side of the Horns of Hattin under the cloudless Syrian sky. Plato or Socrates never conceived such a statement of the obligations of men to themselves, to their fellows and to their God. All literature fails to present an example of teaching so pure, holy, original, profound, independent, sublime,

authoritative, spoken with such a kingly majesty, and yet so amazingly simple. For the government of the world, for the happiness of mankind, for the glory of God, this in itself would seem a perfect rule. No principle of morality, no doctrine of religion which contravenes even this simple testimony would seem tenable for a moment.

But to sit with the people upon the Mount of Beatitudes and hear these gracious words is not all. Christ and his teaching we understand to embrace the four biographies of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. More than any other writings these should be studied and taught. In these brief memories are the proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus. All that is necessary to explain the origin of Christianity in the life of its founder is here. Whatever question is raised concerning the fourth gospel the synoptists, Matthew, Mark and Luke, furnish sketches of the life and doctrine of Jesus which are essentially the same. These narratives contain much that is peculiar to each and much that is common to all, but they have one purpose, to set forth an account of all things that Jesus began both to do and teach, and this, that men might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing they might have have life through his name. The fathers compared the four Gospels to the four rivers flowing out of Eden to water the garden of God, going each a different way, yet all issuing from a single head, passing lands where there was gold and bdellium and onyx stone, and watering the whole earth; again, to the four living creatures of Ezekiel's Vision, each with a different countenance looking a different way, yet all together upholding the

Chariot of God. The comparison is fanciful, but certain it is that these four matchless memoirs, like the Chariot in Ezekiel, the man-Matthew, the lion-Mark, the ox-Luke and the eagle-John, bear this celestial chariot as on a winged throne into all lands; moving as the Spirit guides; seeing, full of eyes, the depths of all hearts and the needs of all society; and showing in their celestial form and grace the fashioning of a divine hand. On these four Gospels we may rest our faith. One unbroken chain of testimony to their truth from this hour back to Jesus Christ, history gives us. Back beyond Cranmer, and Luther, and Calvin; back beyond Huss and Wickliff; back beyond Jerome and Eusebius and Clement; back beyond Justin and Barnabas and Polycarp, we may trace it, till we come to the Church of the living God, to the apostolic age, to within forty years of the crucifixion, showing that these are authentic documents, that they are the work of the authors to whom they are ascribed, and that they have come down to us essentially as they were written. If there were nothing else to witness their truth, the character they present would be sufficient. It stands alone. It can never be accounted for as an invention of the Galileans. "Shall we be told," asks Theodore Parker, "that such a man never lived? that the whole story is a lie? Suppose that Plato and Newton never lived. But who did their wonders? Who thought their thoughts? It takes a Newton to forge a Newton. What man could have fabricated a Jesus? None but a Jesus!"

"The Christ of the Gospels," says Renan, "is the most beautiful incarnation of God in the most beauti-

ful of forms. His beauty is eternal; his reign will never end." Reading this history, studying this character, hearing this voice that comes from heaven, who can fail to be blessed? Obeying these precepts, living these principles, testing all truth and all conduct by this rule, who can fail of the very highest happiness here and hereafter?

Christ and his teaching are not exhausted here, however. His apostles were to speak for him. The Holy Spirit was to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them. The gospel as they preached it; the ordinances as they delivered them; the Christian life as they enforced it, were the voice of Christ spreaking through them to the world. Paul's four epistles which have never been assailed—Galatians, Romans and Corinthians—constitute a fifth Gospel, earlier than any other, the testimony of one of highest culture and clearest intellect converted from the standpoint of a rigid Pharisee to that of an humble disciple. Almost every fact concerning Christ and every doctrine he inculcated may be reproduced from these writings prepared within twenty-five years of their occurrence. His birth of the seed of David; his lowliness of life; the form of his baptism; his moral teaching; his Messiahship; his proclamation of the Kingdom of God; his calling of the apostles; his divine claims; his doctrine of prayer, of benevolence, of immortality; his supernatural power; his betrayal; his establishment of the Lord's supper; his passion, his crucifixion, burial, resurrection and subsequent appearances; his ascension and coronation; his authority and pre-eminence are all declared, and are announced as by the authority

of Christ. "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me." "I certify you brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man, for I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ." "God raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under his feet and gave him to be head over all things to the church." "Through him we both, Jews and Gentiles, have access by one Spirit unto the Father, and are built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone: in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

Here also, then, is the doctrine of Christ and the recognition of that doctrine as the standard of appeal. We hear the Son of God speaking in the other writings of the New Testament. To the teaching and practice of the apostles we appeal as to the veritable words and deeds of the Lord Jesus. The great cham-

pion of Christianity states the whole gospel in three facts—the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ and sums up the whole secret of godliness in "God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." The volume called the New Testament, then, written by the persons whose names it bears and at the time when it is said to have been written; composed in different parts of the world and at sundry intervals of time by eight writers—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter, Paul, James and Jude;—supported by evidences a hundred times more conclusive than would be necessary to convince men of the real authorship of the Annals of Tacitus or the Orations of Cicero; setting forth facts which could easily have been detected and refuted if untrue, and yet so far from being contradicted by any writer of that age are universally admitted both by Jews and Pagans, this Volume stands above all others as the organic law of Christianity, the supreme standard by which all religious truth must be measured, the authoritative embodiment of Christ and his teaching.

Our standard of appeal, however, is yet incomplete. We have not heard all. In showing Christ's superiority over Moses and the prophets on the Mount of Transfiguration, God does not throw any discredit upon the law of Moses or the writings of the prophets. He recognizes them as his representatives in the positions they had held. He associates them with his Son as channels of his communication. In the grand unfolding and development of revelation these instruments are simply shown to have finished

their work. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." Moses spoke for God. The prophets revealed his will as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. Their word in its place was authoritative. Christ endorsed Moses and the prophets; in fact it is upon their testimony that he vindicates his claims. "Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill: for verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law till all be accomplished." "I will not accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, on whom ye have set your hope. For if ye believe in Moses, ye would have believed in me, for he wrote of me; but if ye believe not his writings how shall ye believe my words?" "He said unto them, O foolish men and slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Christ endorses the revelation through Moses as God's Word: "Why do ye transgress the Commandment of God because of your tradition? For God said, Honor thy father and thy mother, and he that speaketh evil of father or mother let him die the death; and ye have made void the Word of God by your tradition." Our Lord gives the same testimony as to the word of the prophets: "Ye hypo-

crites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do ye worship, teaching as your doctrine the commandments of men."

Thus Christ places his stamp upon the Jewish Scriptures as a revelation from God. "Believe in me," says Jesus; and believing in him we must accept his witness concerning the writers of the Old Testament. Nothing is more wonderful than the unity of the Bible. "As in Beethoven's matchless music there runs one idea, worked out through all the changes of measure and key; now almost hidden, now breaking in rich natural melody, whispered in the treble, murmured in the bass, dimly suggested in the prelude, but growing clearer and clearer as the work proceeds, winding gradually back till it ends in the key in which it began and closes in triumphant harmony, so throughout the Bible there runs one great idea—man's ruin by sin, and his redemption by grace; in a word Jesus Christ, the Savior. This runs through the Old Testament, that prelude to the New; dimly promised at the fall and more clearly to Abraham; typified in the ceremonies of the law; all events of sacred history paving the way for his coming; his descent proved in the genealogies of Ruth and Chronicles; spoken of as Shiloh by Jacob, as Star by Balaam, as Prophet by Moses; the David of the Psalms; the Redeemer looked for by Job; the Beloved of the Song of Songs. We find him in the sublime strains of the lofty Isaiah, in the writings of the tender Jeremiah, in the mysteries of the contemplative Ezekiel, in the Visions of the beloved Daniel, the great idea growing clearer and clearer as the time

drew on. Then the full harmony broke out in the song of the angels, 'Glory to God in the highest; peace on earth, good will among men!" And evangelists and apostles taking up the theme, the strain closes in the same key in which it began—the devil who troubled the first Paradise forever excluded from the second; man restored to the favor of God, and Jesus Christ the key-note of the whole.

We are no longer under Moses, but under Christ. The law and the prophets were until John. All appeal is now to the perfect Lawgiver, the Supreme Judge, the one who is Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End, the Author and Finisher of the faith, the incarnation of Wisdom as he is the incarnation of God. Let all ears hear him.

"Who loves not Knowledge? Who shall rail
Against her beauty? May she mix
With men and prosper! Who shall fix
Her pillars? Let her work prevail.

"But on her forehead sits a fire:
She sets her forward countenance
And leaps into the future chance,
Submitting all things to desire.

"Half grown as yet, a child, and vain,
She cannot fight the fear of death.
What is she, cut from love and faith,
But some wild Pallas from the brain

"Of Demons? Fiery hot to burst
All barriers in her onward race
For power. Let her know her place;
She is the second, not the first.

"A higher hand must make her mild,
If all be not in vain; and guide
Her footsteps, moving side by side
With Wisdom, like the younger child:

"For she is earthly of the mind,
But Wisdom, heavenly of the soul."

What result must follow the practical recognition of this standard? A recasting of theology: Christocracy for all other forms of divine government, Christology for all other systems of divine knowledge, Christologists, Christocrats, for all other schools of divine service. In the world of religious thought there have been wonderful changes in fifty years, and the trend has been steadily toward these substitutions. There has been no change in truth, for from its nature truth is eternal and immutable, but in the discoveries of truth, in the views of truth, there has been a great revolution. It has not endangered any principle; it has not remanded to the past any vital teaching of religion. It has not caused any one of the mighty foundations of faith to tremble even for a moment. It has been but a clearing away of rubbish to bring into clearer view the perfect structure which God has reared among men.

First, in theology proper, in the knowledge or views of God, there has been a most essential change. The old theology of the Lutheran reformation, the theology of Calvin, and the Westminster and Savoy Confessions centered in the decrees of God. Men are now living who, in early life, heard nothing but election and damnation preached from the pulpits. It was atheism, not Christianity, for it had little of the essential elements of Christianity about it. It

made men shudder, and has its fruits in our time in many false theories. Benjamin F. Butler did not do an irrational or illogical thing when, at college, on hearing a sermon on election in which the professor asserted that only one in every hundred Christians could be one of the elect, concluded that he need not attend chapel services or preaching any longer, as there was more than one professor for every one hundred students, and, as the faculty would exhaust the allowance, no poor student could aspire to the distinction, and he must therefore be already condemned. It was a high thought to begin thus back in the Eternal purpose of the Almighty, and from that transcendent standpoint develop the whole system of religious truth. The result was a logical, powerful, coherent, but most startling whole. Yet long ago Christian thought quietly, and scarcely aware of the change it was undergoing, detached itself from the old center, and began to swing freely around the new. The old system was narrow and mechanical. In it the elect were everything and everything was for the elect. The new system finds a new center. Christ, who is the historical and divine center of the Christian religion, as he is the vital center of the church, becomes the center of the theology of our time.

Then, with respect to the Godhead, with reference to what men have seen fit to denominate the Trinity, there has been also a change. The old Arian and Athanasian controversy found its way in some form in religious teaching from the third century. The attempt to define the indefinable, to formulate all doctrine, even that which could not be formulated, led to endless differences and difficulties and divisions.

The application by Theophanes of Antioch of the Trias of the Platonic philosophers to the Christian doctrine of God and the use by Tertullian of the Latin term Trinitas have been fruitful of much wild thinking and of great loss to the church. The theology of to-day does not disturb itself greatly concerning these attempted formulations of the past. The age is busy and practical, and Christianity, while accepting God as he is presented to us in the Holy Scriptures and receiving all that is said of God and Christ and the Holy Spirit in all their relations to each other and to man, is disposed to leave the question which so perplexed the Homoousians and Homoiousians to the realm of undefined truth. It has nothing to do with the speculations of Trinitarians and Unitarians. It discards human and unauthorized forms of speech. It receives the words which the Holy Spirit teaches touching secrets which God has withheld. It rejects the arbitrary fetters of human opinion and accepts the plain Gospel statement concerning the infinite mystery of Father, Son and Spirit. This men can receive. This does not divide Christians or drive men into the wilderness of unfaith. This harmonizes with the sensible religious spirit of our time, which calls upon the church to go forward in the grand and simple and essential applications of Christianity, leaving some of the mysteries of godliness to be made clear in the day of perfect knowledge. When Lyman Abbott was asked, at his installation as pastor of Plymouth Church, his belief as to the Trinity, he answered, "I believe in one Divine Spirit who fills the universe with his omnipresence, and is revealed to us by his manifestation in the flesh and the dwelling

of his Spirit in us, but of the relation between Father, Son and Spirit, the question is so great and I am so small that I don't pretend to answer it."

Then, again, theology will not be theology at all, but in the highest sense Christology. The fact of a personal God will be conceded and the mystery of the association in the Godhead will be accepted, but the life of religion will be Christ and its Scriptures the Scriptures of Christ. The creeds and articles of faith will not be found in a Christianity which to the fullest degree recognizes this standard. The old landmarks of struggle between sects and the positions of past theologians will fall into disuse like the fortifications of the days before steel warships and rifled guns. Christ will explain Christianity. In the historic Christ the world will find the explanation of that new power which no one can deny came into the world through his wonderful personality. It will find in him the religious needs of humanity, the culmination of all antecedent development in the Jewish and heathen worlds, the beginning of a new era in human history. It will trace through the ages since his advent the ever-widening stream of religious life, of Christian morality, of Christian civilization. It will show Christianity to-day to be the great moral motive power. It will rest the weight of its argument upon the religious consciousness of the church concerning Christ and the personal conviction of the individual believer — that inner certainty of Christ born of experience which is not an opinion but a knowledge, carrying with it its own self-evidencing proof, the *Testimonium Spiritus Sancti*. This Christocentric tendency will determine the whole religious system. The

preaching, the religious literature, the practical religion of the day will find its vital center in the personality of the God-man Jesus Christ, and will hold loyally and in hearty sincerity to the highest faith in his divine nature. Accepting this standard, the church will never abandon the belief that Christ is in the fullest sense God; but holding this with a steadfast confidence, the church will see new meaning in the humanity of Jesus. Study of Gospel history, of the many lives of Christ, and of the necessities of the human soul, will teach men to find in the man Christ Jesus God manifest in the flesh. The soul will cry with Thomas, "My Lord and my God!" and faith in a creed, faith in a system of opinions, faith in a body of divinity, faith in a catalogue of principles will give way for simple faith in Christ; and men seeking entrance into the church will be asked not whether they believe in this or that dogma about Christ, in Westminster Confession or Augsburg symbol, in thirty-nine articles or five points of doctrine, but, "Do you believe in Jesus the Christ as the Son of God and the Savior of the world?" and on that confession, like the Ethiopian eunuch, they will be baptized and received into the church.

Thus accepting Christ, and Christ simply, and requiring of those seeking her fellowship faith in Christ and obedience to Christ, and nothing more, the church under this standard will be a united church, a simple Christian Church. Has it been so in the past? Is it fully so now? But with all believers appealing simply to Christ, with one creed and a better understanding of the creed; with the Holy Scriptures properly divided and applied; with God's Word alone

revered as authoritative and binding upon the consciences of men; with Christ as the supreme figure and the New Testament as the constitution of the church, and apostolic teaching and testimony as the common law over all associations of the Lord's people, there must be one fold as there is one Shepherd.

Then taking the simple Word of Christ, and its larger expression through the apostles, the faith that will be taught will for this very reason be simple. Pompous forms of the past will be discarded; mysterious dreams and visions of ignorance and superstition will be ignored. Inquiring for Christ and his salvation, men will hear the pure Gospel and be told as the apostles told men in the beginning, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ;" "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins;" "Arise and be baptized and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord;" and thus preaching a simple gospel, a common gospel, an old gospel, a heaven-approved gospel, a world-conquering gospel, the kingdoms of this world must become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ.

Finally, bringing all thought in religion to this ultimate standard the world shall be content to know him as the resurrection and the life, without complete unfolding of the hidden things of God. Of that undiscovered country into whose darkness experience throws no light at all, reason only a faint glimmer, and revelation far less than we would wish, though all we need, we shall still know in part and prophesy in part, only we shall speculate but little. We will accept the simple statements of Him whom we believe to be the very truth of God, as he is the way and the

life to men. We shall look for the work of infinite justice and infinite mercy; and on that darkest and most solemn of all questions—the future of those who persist in their resistance to God's tender of love—we shall shrink from dogmatism, but leave the solution of this problem to him who made man, who loves man, and who can do no wrong. So coming to Christ and his teaching as the last test, we come again to the undying truth of the ages, the unchanging truth of the Bible; not alone to all the words of this life, but to Him who is Himself the way, the truth and the life.

RELATION OF CONSCIENCE AND THE BIBLE.

W. A. OLDHAM.

An exhaustive treatment of our subject would require an answer to three questions: First, "What is Conscience?" Second, "What is the Bible?" Third, "What is the Relation of Conscience to the Bible?" To answer the first question is by no means easy. The answers to the question, "What is Conscience?" are almost as various as are the authorities on the subject. Leaving out of view the abstruse questions involved in the origin of knowledge, and the consequent origin of the moral faculty, it is quite a difficult matter to determine what the moral faculty is. Kant and his school hold that conscience is the practical reason. Says Henry Calderwood, "Conscience is the reason, as that discovers to us absolute moral truth, having the authority of sovereign moral law." Again, he says: "The more effectually to secure such accuracy, it is of consequence to make the popular term, 'conscience,' apply to the reason in the moral application in contrast with reason in its speculative bearings." By the term, "reason," Kant and his school mean the faculty of intuitions, the faculty of implied truths, the regulative faculty of Sir William Hamilton. As seen by the quotations from Calderwood, when this faculty is employed in the discovery of other intuitive truth, it is called simply the reason;

but when used to discover moral truth, though it is precisely the same faculty, then according to Kant and his school it becomes conscience. It logically follows, if this definition be admitted, that conscience can not be educated, and Kant is entirely consistent in claiming that an erring conscience is a chimera.

McCosh, in his works on the subject, differs from the school of Kant, in that the latter makes conscience purely a cognitive power, while the former says it is both cognitive and motive, and in his Psychology of the Motive Powers devotes a chapter to it under each of these heads.

President Gregory, in his Christian Ethics, says: "Ethical writers have used conscience in different senses. By mankind in general it is clearly used as synonymous with man's entire moral nature, or all the endowments and arrangements of his soul by which he is capable of discovering right and wrong and of conforming his conduct to the law of duty."

"Conscience, therefore," says Joseph Cook, "may be briefly and provisionally defined as a faculty including both a perception and a feeling,—a perception of right and wrong in the nature of choices and intentions, and a feeling that right ought and the wrong ought not to be carried out by the will. Conscience is that which perceives and feels rightness and obligatoriness in choices." In common parlance conscience is sometimes a feeling, as in the phrase, "My conscience hurts me," sometimes a judgment.

These quotations sufficiently indicate the confusion of thought regnant among those who have devoted their attention to this subject. Conscience is a sign, as is every word a sign—a sign of a thought in the

mind. One of the laws of thought involved in the use of signs is that we may demand at any time that the thought be substituted for the sign. When we attempt this, however, we are at a loss to know just what thought to substitute for conscience. According to Kant, the reason; according to McCosh, a cognitive and a motive power; according to Mr. Cook, a perception and a feeling; while Gregory says: "All the endowments and arrangements of his soul by which he is capable of discovering right and wrong, and of conforming his conduct to the law of duty." A definition which would almost identify the terms "mind" and "conscience."

Must it ever be thus? Is conscience a sign, but a sign of nothing signified? Is it one sign, with various corresponding thoughts? Or is there some mental territory, some "unexplored remainder," to which the laws of thought rigidly applied will guide us as unerringly as the mariner's compass guides him to the desired haven? We shall see.

One of the fundamental postulates of the logicians is: "There is such a thing as truth, which can be ascertained, and on which all minds, acting in accordance with the laws of thought, must agree. Without this there can be no starting point for thought, no goal of activity for the thought power" (Gregory's logic). Now the law of thought involved in the use of signs already mentioned, and this self-evident postulate, are either false or else men have never determined what conscience is. In other words, an adequate definition of conscience is yet to be made.

The faculties of the mind are named from their functions. It must be kept in view that the mind is a

unit. It has not parts, as the body, but has only different functions. These various functions are the several faculties, each named according to the office which it performs. Thus we have two great classes of faculties, the cognitive and the motive, a distinction based upon the different functions in each case.

We have also such special faculties as the imagination, so called because it makes images, the retentive faculty, which retains what was once before the mind, the symbolic, which uses symbols or signs in thinking. These are not mere names, but are so many landmarks, indicating where certain dividing lines are, and where these lines ever must be so long as the human soul is what it is. These facts should be kept in mind in determining what conscience is; in other words, in deciding what are its functions.

The fundamental mistake of most writers on moral science lies in the fact that they define conscience to be the power by which we discriminate between right and wrong. To many this may seem a bold departure from orthodox belief. I ask a candid hearing, however, and if the position be untenable it will be no difficult matter to relegate it to the obscurity from which it has for the moment emerged.

My first argument in syllogistic form is this: The discovery of truth is the function of the intellect. The discovery of the moral quality of an action or series of actions is the discovery of truth. Therefore, the discovery of the moral quality of an action or a series of actions is the function of the intellect.

In other words, the discrimination of right and wrong is a function of the intellect. Are intellect

and conscience identical in whole or in part? Our first premise, viz., The discovery of truth is a function of the intellect, will be admitted by all perhaps. That the argument may be unimpeachable, however, I shall endeavor to demonstrate the truthfulness of the second premise as well. The criterion of truth, according to Hamilton, is the correspondence of a cognition with its object, "or including both thought and statement; truth is the agreement of a thought or statement with the reality which the thought or statement concerns." I cognize a certain act, and I pronounce it right or wrong as the case may be. If I pronounce an act right, and it is right, there is a correspondence between a cognition and its object, the act in question—*i. e.*, there is a truth cognized or discovered. If, on the contrary, I cognize an act and pronounce it right when it is wrong, then the cognition and its object do not correspond, and we have error or untruth. Measured by this criterion, then, the discovery of the moral quality of an act is the discovery of truth. The first premise admitted, the second established, the conclusion follows: viz., The discovery of the moral quality of an action is a function of the intellect.

This may be more clearly seen by means of an illustrative example. We read in the newspapers that one man has killed another. The moral quality of the act of killing belongs only to the perpetrator of the deed; that is, the slayer is morally innocent or guilty, as the case may be, not I or any other man who sees an account of the killing. Yet we can by attention to the details, if accurately presented, determine to a nicety the amount of guilt to be attached to the mur-

derer. This shows that the mere discrimination between right and wrong is an intellectual act, and purely such. One is no more responsible for discriminating between right and wrong than he is for discriminating between the colors of the rainbow, or between an acute and an obtuse angle. With this conclusion agree the words of Henry Calderwood, Professor of Moral Science in the University of Edinburg: "Conscience, in discovering to us truth, having the authority of moral law, is seen to be a cognitive or intellectual power. Moral judgments are not distinguished by moral quality as right or wrong, but by intellectual quality as true or false."

So also, Dr. McCosh: "A man is made good not by distinguishing between good and evil, but by choosing the good and avoiding the evil."

Dr. Martineau defines conscience to be the knowledge within one's self of the better and worse. Joseph Cook, as already stated, makes conscience a perception and a feeling, a perception of rightness and a feeling of obligatoriness. A perception of whatever character is an intellectual act.

There are objections, to me insuperable, to all definitions of conscience which make it in whole or in part an intellectual power. It has resulted in confusion hitherto and will ever do so. With the exception of Kant's school, none make conscience purely intellectual. Other elements are introduced because when discrimination between right and wrong is made there comes the impulse to the right, the feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, as the case may be.

A few words here as to Kant's statement that the conscience is the practical reason, or the intuitive

power turned to moral questions. When this power discovers mathematical axioms or logical postulates, then it is called simply the reason, or the intuitive power. By consent of the advocates of this definition of conscience there has been no change within the power itself. Whatever change has occurred is entirely external to the faculty. There is not even a change of function. It still instantaneously discovers truth: the objects about which it is busied, and the objects only, are changed, and, presto! that which erstwhile was reason or the regulative faculty is now become conscience. As well give the eye different names when in one case it looks upon a landscape and in another upon a crowd. As well call a sewing machine a silk machine or a calico machine because it is used on different fabrics. Its function is to sew, whatever the fabric, and it is properly called a sewing machine. So the intuitive faculty is the intuitive faculty, and not conscience, simply because in the one case it happens to be directed to mathematical axioms and in the other to moral principles.

Kant's view of conscience violates at least two of the laws of thought involved in definition. One of the rules for definition is that we must bring out a distinguishing attribute of the thing defined. This definition, however, identifies the intuitive power and conscience, two faculties as different as possible.

A definition must also be adequate, which this is not, for it omits the impulse to the right, and away from the wrong. The same objections apply to all definitions which make conscience, in any sense an exercise of the intellect. The truths of moral science are discovered in two ways. The basic principles of

the science, like the basic principles of mathematics and all other sciences, are discovered intuitively. To know the right in any given case may require an inductive or a deductive process, may require proof which may be either demonstrative or probable. Yet all this is plainly an exercise of the intellect, and in the discovery of other truth is seen to be such, and the powers in exercise are seen to be intellectual. Why confuse matters by calling a part of the intellectual domain conscience, especially when there is an "unexplored remainder" of the mental domain waiting to be named, and enclosing within its boundaries "the essential characteristics," the peculiar characteristics of conscience. Let the intellectual be such forever, and let us not confuse counsel by invading its territories without due warrant.

We may now proceed to define conscience. Butler long since established the fact that the conscience was supreme in the soul. He says, "Had it power as it has authority it would rule the world." He touches here the key-note of the true definition of conscience. *Conscience is the Imperative Faculty*—only this and nothing more. When the intellect makes known the right, or makes known the wrong, then conscience commands the one and prohibits the other. It is this and all that is implied in this. Conscience sits among its subject faculties like a queen enthroned. Cicero, with fine insight, calls it "God within us." It is right that the soul use every endeavor to know the right. Hence the conscience commands the soul to use its cognitive faculties to the uttermost, that right may be found. It says, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." For many reasons, however, the intellect is an ineffi-

cient servant, and obeys but imperfectly the commands of its divine superior. Through prejudice, through passion, through sloth, through ignorance, or all combined, though commanded to be free from all, because it is right to be so, the intellect often brings black for white and white for black, good for evil and evil for good. As conscience commands the right and forbids the wrong, and as she must trust her servant intellect for a correct report as to the right and the wrong, she is seen to be, though a queen, still dependent on her servants. Through the boundaries of the intellect sins march in troops to invade the moral nature. It is the intellect and not the conscience which makes the blunder. It is the intellect and not the conscience which is fallible. Saul thought it his duty to exterminate Christians until his intellect was enlightened. Conscience always commands the right and forbids the wrong, though what it commands may be wrong and what it forbids may be right, because of the blundering guidance of the intellect. The relation of conscience and intellect is like that between the commander of an army and his chief of cavalry. The latter is the eyes and ears of the former. He sends out scouting parties, he questions every citizen, he scours the country, and if worthy, is never satisfied until the numbers, position, purpose, and resources of the enemy are, if possible, as thoroughly known to himself as to the general in chief of the opposing host. All this information gathered with such untiring energy he imparts to his general, who is thus freed from the danger of ignorant blundering. So the intellect must search for truth and bring the information to conscience, who commands the right

and prohibits the wrong. "If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness."

The intellect, however, is not the only servant of conscience. The will is her executive officer. When the intellect has discovered the right, conscience commands the will to do it. If the will is obedient to the heavenly precept, harmony, "the peace of God which passeth all understanding," comes within the microcosm, within the little universe which we call soul. The will, however, is sometimes rebellious, and then the blackness comes.

The conscience is not only authoritative, but powerful as well. Who can measure the pangs of remorse, that direful, puissant servant of conscience? Mere physical pain can be borne with great degree of fortitude, but a wounded spirit, an outraged conscience, who can bear? I can imagine nothing more horrible then a spirit out of harmony with God and itself throughout all the ages. Thus, as an authoritative power, conscience is capable of punishing and can enforce her behests.

In all probability God has seldom, if ever, spoken in person to man. The Bible represents him as speaking through messengers or angels. These angels are called God, however, and men, as in the famous conversation with Abraham just previous to the destruction of Sodom, are represented as addressing themselves to God. So conscience is in common parlance confused with her servants. It is confounded with intellect, as already seen. Sometimes, on the other hand, it is represented as identical with the happiness consequent upon obedience to her commands, or with the remorse which flows from disobe-

dience to this benign sovereign. Yet happiness and remorse are feelings, and are not conscience. As in the case of the intellect, so here. Conscience must not be made to trespass upon the territory of the sensibilities any more than upon the territory of the intellect. She uses the intellect to discover truth. She uses the sensibilities to enforce her commands. This remorse, this happiness, are well known constituents of the mental territory devoted to the sensibilities, and strict scientific accuracy requires that they never be confounded with conscience, whose functions are so entirely different.

Let me now apply the laws of thought here, and if my conclusion is in harmony with them all, then, through no unwarranted confidence in my own powers, but through absolute confidence in all-powerful law, I may claim that the position is demonstrated.

First, we apply the law as to the use of signs or words as symbols of thought. Conscience is the imperative faculty. Here we have one sign for one thought corresponding. We may substitute the thought for the sign and no essential element of conscience is omitted, nor are the constituent elements of some other faculty included. Not so with the definitions of Calderwood, Cook, McCosh, Gregory and others. Moreover, the rules for definitions are all satisfied. First, our definition clearly distinguishes conscience from the intellect, on the one hand, and the will and the sensibilities on the other. It fully satisfies the rule which requires us to bring out a distinguishing attribute of the notion defined. The function of conscience is to command, a function of no other faculty, so far as known to me.

So also this definition is adequate in accord with the demands of the second rule. The definition, conscience is the imperative faculty, is neither too broad nor too narrow. It is not broad enough to lop over on other psychological domain, it is not so narrow but that it just covers a bit of territory lying between the intellect on the one hand and the will and sensibilities on the other.

It also meets the test of a perfect definition, simple conversion. The conscience is the imperative faculty, the imperative faculty is conscience. No other definition does. This impulse or command to the right, Joseph Cook calls a feeling, and this brings it under the head of sensibility. Gregory calls it an intuitive judgment, assigning it to the domain of the intellect. This shows the difficulty of assigning this principle of oughtness, this "categorical imperative," to any of the three great divisions of the mind. The old Roman orator had the correct view, I think, when he claimed "conscience to be God within us." It is beyond question the God-faculty, the crowning possession which lifts humanity to communion with God. "Conscience is the ear," says one, "by which we hear the whisperings of the Holy Spirit."

It seems that the current of thought has recently turned in the direction of this definition as a final settlement of this *questio vexata*. Of this there are several indications. Dr. McCosh caught a glimpse of the truth when he says, "This conviction of obligation is one of the peculiarities, is indeed the chief peculiarity of our moral perceptions. This conviction of obligation distinguishes it from the other motive as it does from the other cognitive powers of the mind."

Strange that Dr. McCosh did not, in accordance with one of his own rules of definition, bring out this distinguishing attribute in his definition.

After I had been teaching for some time the foregoing definition of conscience, I received from its publishers a little book called "Rudiments of Psychology," in which occurred, to my great surprise and satisfaction, the following language: "When a person determines that a certain action is right for him to do and wrong for him not to do, there is a feeling of obligation, an impulse to do it, inclining toward the right and away from the wrong. It will be noticed that this feeling is consequent upon the determination or judgment concerning the character of the act, and is no part of the judgment. This, it seems to me, is the peculiar and essential function of conscience. Indeed, it may be doubted if there is any other function so closely connected with this as to be properly regarded as a modification of it. There is certainly no need that conscience do the judging and the reasoning which are here implied, since the same faculties which usually do the judging and the reasoning are fully competent for the same office here. In this view of conscience, as a simple impulsive faculty or force, we have a power which acts uniformly and universally, and which is also in its proper sphere infallible. That is, it *always impels us to do what we judge to be right and not to do what we judge to be wrong.* It does this, if it does anything. It may be so misused or abused as to become inactive, or we may so habitually disregard its admonitions that we cease to feel them; but whenever its voice is heard at all it always urges us to do what one's judgment and reason

approve as right, and it does this in all men."—*Steele's Rudimentary Psychology.*

It is not the province of this paper to discuss the standard of rectitude. Such a question is entirely too large to attempt to discuss it in a paper of the dimensions of this. Whatever be the true ethical theory, the positions assumed in this paper remain untouched. If you believe in Hedouism, or the theory of pleasure; or in Altruism, the theory that makes it man's highest duty to seek the happiness of others; or Egotism, or self-interest; Utilitarianism, or the theory of the useful, conscience still commands the right and forbids the wrong, just as the intellect discovers the pleasureable, just as it discovers the useful, or that which is not conducive to self-interest. Conscience still commands the intellect to bring truth; she still urges the will to enforce truth; she wields the moral sensibilities like a scorpion's lash to enforce her imperial edicts. Whatever our theory, the relations and functions of the faculties remain the same.

THE RELATION OF THE BIBLE TO CONSCIENCE.

To determine this we must determine, First, God's relation to man; second, God's relation to the Bible. As to the first question, "God is the Creator of heaven and earth and all that in them is." I believe that now, as in the olden time, only "the fool says in his heart, There is no God." As the infinite Creator and Sovereign of the universe, God is the Being to whom man is absolutely subject by virtue of the creative act. His authority over man is unquestionable, and over each and all of the faculties constituent of man's mental and moral nature. This

not because of the arbitrary edict of a despotic omnipotence; but because infinite wisdom, infinite beneficence, infinite justice and omnipotence can not err. Whatever God commands is best for man. The laws of God are inexorable, not because of any unbending obstinacy on the part of the Deity, but because these laws, as the products of infinite wisdom, infinite justice, infinite beneficence and omnipotence, are the best possible laws, and any change would be for the worse. Therefore, in heeding the voice of God man is really seeking the highest interest of his own being. Infancy must be guided by maturity, folly must yield to wisdom, the finite to the infinite. Nor is it true that man has raised a colossal image of himself to the throne of the universe, as Prof. Tyndall intimates. If Prof. Tyndall had alluded to the Jupiter of the Greeks and the Romans, and the subject gods of those mythologies, then, indeed, he might have truly said that these were simply men deified, but if deified, still retaining all the passions and weaknesses of men. The exalted God of the Hebrew Scriptures, the God whose essential attributes are represented as the same in Old and New Testament alike, this God is precisely the God which men in all ages, and among them Prof. Tyndall, have sought to dethrone, as the inveterate tendency to idolatry or a lower deity amply illustrates,—a tendency still regnant among the majority of the race. Who can read the awful atrocities which the savages of the Congo Basin inflict upon each other without feeling that these nations need a great light, even a divine light, to shine among them also, as it in the long ago once shone among those who sat in darkness? These

tribes are not an object lesson illustrative of the law of evolution or the survival of the fittest. They exhibit little if any more regard for each other than the savage beasts of the forests about them. They are a God-forsaken race; and, untaught of God, follow the law of their kind, which is retrogression. The savage mother on the banks of the Congo, as she croons her lullaby to her naked babe, instills into his young mind only the wild superstitions and the savage cruelties prevalent among those about her. How can the child be better than his mother? How can the stream be higher than its source? The Chinaman has remained the Chinaman for many thousands of years, and promises to remain so for many thousands of years to come, unless the Christian, Bible in hand, awakes him from his lethargy. Consider, if you please, the vast force which is constantly acting through the pulpit and the religious press of our country, driving moral ideas into the minds and hearts of men, reminding them of their responsibilities, of their spirituality, of their immortality. Consider how difficult even then it is to bring man up to the moral standard; that they are ever standing on tiptoe to reach the divine thought, and that many never reach it even then in our Christian countries. Yet the majority of the souls of this earth have never heard a sermon, will never hear one. They have no Lord's day, no Sunday-school, no men of God, no women of God, no gradual inbibition of the thoughts of God until, even though bitter enemies of God and unscrupulous assailants of his Word, they still unconsciously throw out its thoughts and are influenced by its morality. Yea, a man is truly dependent on God, as history amply shows. To find

God, to know him, is the chief duty of the present life.

Is the Bible God's book? Is it the means by which he reveals himself? If not, whose book? If the voice of God has broken the silence of the ages at all, where, unless in the Bible? Is man's soul, his consciousness, his intellect, his spiritual and moral nature, the measure of the universe? He cannot measure an atom of it. I do not know how the Bible came to be God's book any more than I know how the earth came to be God's world. I see the Godhead in both—revealed in one, manifested in the other. As the physical universe about us is an inexplicable enigma apart from God, so also is the Bible. As Henry Rogers has shown, it is God's book, in as much as God is its principal theme. God is in the first paragraph of Genesis, and Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is in the last verse of Revelation—God as supreme, as infinite, omniscient, omnipotent. The Bible passes by as unworthy of its thought the pigmy histories and revolutions of man as physical and dwelling in him, as when compared with man as spiritual and dwelling in eternity. Strange that men of like passions with ourselves should have written a book the most striking peculiarity of which is that it teaches that all for which we strive here is comparatively worthless, that this world and all appertaining to it is but transient and ephemeral, while that which we do not see is eternal and real. If God has authority, and man must obey him, then the Bible, as God's book, as the standard of objective truth, the court of final appeal to which we must all come, is binding upon our consciences. The Old Testament is not now bind-

ing upon the conscience of the Christian; still as the conscience is to command only that which comes to us through the intellect, the soul sensitive to the divine truth will be able to cull many wholesome lessons, moral and spiritual, from its inspired pages. The New Testament, such parts of it as set forth moral and spiritual truth at all, is our standard. The conscience heeds it as a voice of God. It obeys it, not as it obeys Homer and Shakespeare and Dante, but as carrying the mind of God to the mind of man, bringing man to that high moral plane in which his soul is in harmony, in which the intellect, freed from its impediments, operates perfectly, reporting only truth; the will obeys its sovereign and man and his faculties are brought under the domain of conscience, thus solving the problem of life, and restoring harmony in man's moral nature and between man and his God. The great purpose of man's life, subjectively, is to bring every thought, every volition, every emotion into loving and willing obedience to the dictates of conscience. Objectively, man's greatest purpose is to know God, to know him through nature, if you will, through himself if it pleases, but most assuredly and most important of all, to know God as he has revealed himself in the Bible, the clearest, best, fullest revelation which God has ever made, or will ever make to man in his present state of being. The trouble about the inspiration of Homer and Shakespeare is that their inspiration is an inspiration which is purely human. That God has anything to do with it other than to endow them with faculties of high order is an assumption, a begging of the question in controversy. I presume if Homer and Shakespeare were inspired

they were unconscious of inspiration in any other sense than that in which we are all conscious of our thoughts. The Scriptures expressly declare that God's prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit which spake to Philip and said, "Join yourself to that chariot," was one personality; Phillip was another. The spirits of the Philip kind gave us the Iliad, the Æneid, the plays of Shakespeare, the histories of Macaulay and Carlyle, the great human books on all subjects. The Spirit that spake to Philip's spirit gave us the Bible, and this shines like a golden chord through its pages from Genesis to Revelation.

The evidence that the Bible is God's Book is cumulative. A single drop of water is not very potent for good or ill. A mighty multitude of drops breaks the strongest reservoir, sweeps the Connemaugh valley, whirls populous cities to ruin, and fills nations with awe and fear by its irresistibly destructive force. So the Word of God, here a little, there a little, line upon line, precept upon precept, growing as the continents grow, until it is almost as hopeless to trace all of the individual authors as it is to trace the individual insect that produced such and such a part of the coral reef. What matters it, if we have God's thought, whether this man or that man produced it?

God's word, strange to say, was made in the face of the hostility of the nation among whom the prophets lived. The Jews stoned the prophets, crucified Christ, persecuted his apostles. The little walls built among the hills of Judea to restrain God's word have been snapped like gossamer threads, and the mighty flood moving on, driven by that irresistible force,

God's Love, promises to fill the world with peace and good will. As God is eternal, so his word is eternal. The Bible is still ten thousand years in advance of the human race, it will be the standard to which we must come for ages yet unborn.

"Almighty Lord, the sun shall fail,
The moon forget her nightly tale;
And deepest silence hush on high
The radiant chorus of the sky.

"But fixed for everlasting years,
Unmoved amid the wreck of spheres,
Thy word shall shine in cloudless day
When Heaven and Earth have passed away."

WHO WROTE THE PENTATEUCH?

GEO. PLATTENBURG.

The disciples of the "Higher Criticism," or perhaps better, the anti-traditionalists, hold that the Pentateuch, in its present form, is the product of many writers, and written in times widely separated; that not less than a thousand years were consumed in its development from some small but fruitful germ of unsettled origin up to the shape in which we now have it. The Elohistic, of which there were three recensions, and Jahvistic, of which it is claimed that there were also three recensions, were combined by a redactor, and subsequently revised by other redactors. Then came the work of the Deuteronomist; subsequently the Priest-code. A final Redactor combined the united Elohistic-Jahvistic records, the work of the Deuteronomist and the Priest-code, thus forming the Hexateuch, that is to say, the five books and Joshua as we now have them.

As already said, these documents were widely separated in years. The legislative part of Deuteronomy is placed as late as the eighteenth year of King Josiah (B. C. 621), parts preceding and following at a much later date. Dr. Toy, indeed, fixes this time as "the beginning of the Pentateuchal legislation;" the

Priest-code, during the time of Ezekiel, and was post-exilic; the Hexateuch, taking its present form, was introduced by Ezra in the year 444 B. C.

These documents are assumed to contain three principal groups of legislation. The Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20: 23—23: 33); the Deuteronomic law and the Levitical code. The two last, as we have seen, were assumed to have been introduced centuries after the death of Moses. This proven, the Mosaic authorship must be given up.

THE BASIS.

The theory lying primarily at the basis of what is called the "Scientific Method" is, that the Jewish religion, in common with all others, is a natural development; that it was the product of national idiosyncracies and environment. Kuenen says, "It is nothing less and nothing more." A distinguished physicist of this school in a very short paper uses these expressions: "The evolution of the moral nature," "the evolution of morality," "the evolution of religion," and this follows as a legitimate corollary: "The religions of all races have been evolved, not *revealed* in full, if revealed *at all.* The religion of each age, each race, each individual man, has been the outcome of such knowledge as each age, each race, each individual has possessed." Graf very promptly declares that the fixing of the particular epoch of the Mosaic legislation is to be determined as to whether we regard it as "a result of a gradual development proceeding out of a fruitful germ, or as a thing completed at the first and lying at the base of every further development." The negative critics

apply the development theory not alone to the legislation, but to that which must be the ground of all true legislation, viz., the Theistic conception. The *Yahve* of Israel was borrowed from Mesopotamia. He was a sky-god, particularly of thunder-storms, and of the stars. After awhile moral attributes came to be associated with him, and finally, in the eighth century B. C., the prophetic conception became dominant, as the one God of Israel. Keunen speaks on this wise: "The *people* acknowledged and worshiped other gods besides *Yahveh*, and thus fell naturally into what is called by a technical name—*syncretism*—that is, into a combination and intermingling of ideas and customs which had originally been connected with various gods: the *prophets* saw in Jahveh the only god, and so came naturally, as it were, to ascribe to him all the attributes and characteristics which in Polytheism and by the people were distributed among the different gods: the *law*, finally, must be regarded as a compromise between the popular religion and the Yahvism of the prophets." Here you have first a popular crudity, second, the prophetic Yahvism, and third, the compromise—and lo! the product of the combination is the God of Israel. This is development with a vengeance; and yet, it is its necessary outcome. The sole records to which the critics appeal afford no vestige of trustworthy proof of this monstrous theory. The God of the Decalogue, of the First Legislation, a thousand years before the assumed prophetic conception, is that God is one—"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." The God of the Deuteronomist, "Hear, O, Israel, the Lord our God is *one* Lord. The Lord he is God; there is none

else beside him." The God of Isaiah, "the eagle of the sun whose nest is Calvary," is thus described: "I am the first and I the last; and beside me there is no God"—these all embody an identical Theistic conception, and wholly disprove Kuenen's idea. If we grant, with Kuenen, that the people did worship other gods besides Jahveh, it was not in the absence of a pure Jahvistic conception, but in spite of it, as it was already in existence, which is the very thing the critic denies.

The general statement of development is no where proven. History has no record of any religion being gradually developed by slow accretions into its highest forms. This question lies purely within the domain of history.

Again, the theory of development involves, and necessarily leads to, a rejection of the supernatural element; and the objection of Smith and other critics, that forty years were too short a time for the growth of such a code possesses no significance if the supernatural factor be conceded. They enter upon their work by the manifestation of an intense distaste towards the supernatural. The theory can only exist by the absolute elimination of the supernatural factor. Special divine revelation acts upon them as a red rag in the face of Taurus. "No just perception," boldly says one, "of history is possible without a perception of the inviolability of the chain of finite causes and the impossibility of miracles." "Miracles," says Kalisch, "are at once impossible and incredible." Baur denies the "trustworthiness" and the historical credibility of the records because they give "an account of events which are either abso-

lutely or relatively beyond the reach of experience (ordinary), such as occurrences connected with the spiritual world, or dealing with the supernatural." With Kalisch, divine revelation precisely coincides with human knowledge and wisdom, and is no more than "the intellectual or moral elevation of the man himself striving to rise to the utmost greatness and purity of his nature." Colenso expresses this result of the negative criticism thus: "Perhaps the most marked result of the criticism of the Pentateuch is this, that it strikes a death-blow at the whole system of priest-craft, which has mainly been based upon the notion that the Levitical laws . . . were really of Mosaic or *rather of divine origin.*" Coleneso repudiates the historical credibility of the records and assumes that the statements of Exodus "imply the artful fiction of an author or authors who attempted to promulgate their own devices as divine or supernatural arrangements." What these Germans mean by "the inviolability of the chain of finite causes," "the impossibility of miracles," and Colenso by the "artful fiction" of "supernatural arrangements," so rendering the records "unhistorical," "unscientific" and "incredible," Robertson Smith means by the gingerly-put statement, "The whole business of scholarly exegesis lies with the human side." The critical theory does and must eliminate absolutely the last shred of supernaturalism from the whole matter of Biblical exegesis, and this the critics concede. And still the records themselves always and everywhere assume the intervention of a supernatural and miraculous element, and claim for themselves in express terms a supernatural origin. These scrip-

tures were "God-breathed," and came in words which the Holy Spirit taught, to the express end that our religion should stand in "the wisdom of God and the power of God." It does not occur here, and it occurs no where else, that developments are in straight lines. It has been well said (Bissell): "Like every thing else in this world of ours that has lived and made itself felt, the progress of the Jewish religion was never in straight lines of growth, but always by a kind of action and re-action; revealing mighty forces that pushed it onward, but also other forces only less mighty that pushed it backward—a sort of systole and diastole that ever marks the throbbings of a deeper life in human affairs." It is a definite fact that the "re-actions" in the religious life of the Hebrews were not connected with new, but with a return to old truths. Not only shortness of time, but also the undeveloped state of the people is urged as fatal to the ordinary theory. They were "barbarous" and continued so till the time of David, if we are to believe Prof. Toy. With Smith they were the "Nomads of Goshen," who, after the death of Moses, were "transformed into the civilized inhabitants of vineyard land and cities of Canaan." This is the sheerest fancy, and contrary to all the necessary implications of the case. These people had been for four hundred years under the most distinguished civilization of antiquity. It suits the "negative criticism" to assume a low state of civilization, and a fetich religion for Egypt and Syria, with the additional claim that Monotheism was the product of the eighth century B. C. Toy doubts whether either Moses or the Decalogue were Monotheistic. The

facts are palpably against the assumption made to meet the exigencies of a theory. Renouf says: "It is certain that at three thousand years B. C. there was in Egypt a powerful and elaborately organized monarchy, enjoying a material civilization, in many respects not inferior to that of Europe in the last century. Centuries must have elapsed before such a civilization became possible." At that period (about 3,000 B. C.) Egypt had an organized state, language, written characters, an established religion, books of morals, and art in its noblest and truest sense. A great German has described the splendor of Egypt's civilization in these beautiful words: "Like Pallas Athena from the head of Jove, from the night of past ages fully equipped, entered upon the stage of human action, and at the summit of the Egyptian Pantheon there soared a God, unique, immortal, uncreated, invisible, and hidden in the depths of his own essence," one, supreme, self-existent, eternal and omnipotent God. With the testimony of ancient records and monuments, the voice of modern investigation is in perfect accord. Prof. Proctor, in discussing the pyramid of Ghizeh and the method of its orientation, says that it was done by the star Alpha Draconis, the El Thuban of the ancient astronomy. It was calculated by what is known as the precession of the Equinoxes. He says: "The last epoch when the star was thus placed (as pole-star) was *circiter* 2160 B. C. The epoch next before that was 3440 B. C., and between these two we should chose; for the next epoch before the earlier of the two was about 28,000 B. C., and the pyramid's date cannot have been more remote than 4000 B. C. Taking Proctor's calcu-

lation, what follows? That 4000 B. C. Egypt possessed the elements of a most exalted and splendid civilization; that geography, astronomy, mathematics, mechanics and architecture of the noblest type, are all written upon this mysterious structure of the desert, in characters uneffaced by the wonder-laden and corroding flight of fifty centuries. If Max Muller is to be believed, letters came from the Egyptian through the Phenicians to the Greeks and Romans, millenniums before Homer's sonorous rythm or the sweet "Virgilian measure." "In every letter we trace," says the great Oxford linguist, "there lies imbedded the mummy of an ancient Egyptian hieroglyphic." After four centuries of residence in this country, came the "barbarous Nomads of Goshen" under Moses. With the modern scientific attestation and with the ancient monuments agree the Pentateuchal records themselves, for they claim for the people of the Exodus great advancement in the elements of civilization. The Hebrews built cities, (Ex. 1), made brick (Ex. 5: 7), were skilled in masonry and the service of the field (Ex. 1: 14), worked in wood, metal and precious stones (Ex. 32: 2; 35: 30), were engravers, spinners, weavers, and embroiderers (Ex. 35: 35). After four hundred years of residence in a country of which Brugsch says, "Intellectual life was developed in its full compass," came the "barbarous" "Nomads of Goshen," under a leader wise in all Egypt's lore. Alas for the exigencies of a theory, basing a vast critical fabric on very "thin air." The castle-in-the-air character of the criticism is made very apparent in Smith's statement, that the writer lived in Western Palestine, and that

therefore the Pentateuch was not written by Moses or "in the wilderness," based solely on the use of the ambiguous phrase "beyond the Jordan." This proves, he says, unambiguously, that the Pentateuch was written in Canaan. This is mere trifling and unworthy of grave criticism. The phrase, "beyond the Jordan," the Hebrew, *da-ebers*, means simply "at the crossing of the Jordan," and with one single exception in its ten occurrences in Deuteronomy its meaning is settled by adjunctive phrases, as "over against the Red sea," "in the land of Moab," "toward the sun-rising," "by the way where the sun goeth down." Now it means the east side of Jordan, as (Deut. 4: 47-49) on this side Jordan, toward the *sun-rising;* from Aroer, which is by the bank of the river Arnon even unto Mt. Sion; and now (Deut. 11: 30) it is the west side, "On the other side Jordan, where the *sun goeth down*, in the land of the Canaanites, over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh." Beyond the Jordan, "*da-ebers*," may mean either east or west side, and yet Robertson Smith finds in it "unambiguous proof" that the writer lived in Western Palestine. On so slender a thread is suspended so large a fabric. The denial that the Pentateuch was written by Moses in the wilderness is next based upon the use of the name of God in Genesis. In some parts we have Elohim and in others Jehovah. This is the point of departure of the modern so-called "scientific method," and its resulting hypothesis of separate documents. The ground of the conclusion possesses little critical value in the decision of the case. Nothing strikes one so strongly as the utter uncertainty of the criteria and inclusive-

ness of the arguments employed by the critics, more of which we will see farther on. Whilst there are some noteworthy things in the alternations of these words, yet they afford a very slender basis for a theory that overturns the accepted traditions and established belief of centuries before and after Christ. So large a part do these names play in this theory that DeWette speaks of an "Elohim Epic," which is the fundamental portion of Genesis; and Tuch declares that not "Genesis alone but the whole Hexateuch, excepting Deuteronomy, including the legislation, has its basis on historical composition in which God is styled Elohim." Now, it is a fact, and fatal to the theory that the Elohim documents are *not* all Elohistic, nor the Jehovah exclusively Jahvistic. This fact may be met by their usual effective and facile method, viz., by the introduction of a redactor, of which method Prof. Green thus speaks: "Ever ready for any emergency in the way of transposition, modification, excision, insertion and re-adjustment *ad libitum*, and a latitude of conjecture which has no check but the pleasure of the operator, it seems versatile and pliant enough to be equal to anything. It can either shape itself to accord with the facts, or can shape the facts to suit its own requirements." Genesis IV. is by the critics classed as Jahvistic, and yet Elohim occurs in verse 25. Gen. XVII. is Elohistic, yet in the very first verse Jehovah is used interchangeably with El Shaddai. Gen. 28: 20-22 contains a recorded vow of Jacob, in which he vowed: "If Elohim will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then

shall Jehovah be my Elohim, and this stone which I have set up for a pillar shall be Elohim's house." In Ex. 3: 1-6, in the account of the burning bush, we have again these names interchangeably used, and thus showing the uncertainty and insufficiency of the critical criteria employed. Besides it is possible to find a satisfactory solution in the progressive revelation of great moral facts and purposes and thus of certain changed relations of God to the race.

It is assumed by the theory of separate documents that in Ex. 6: 3 the name Jehovah was then for the first time made known to Moses. "To know the name of Jehovah" is of frequent occurrence and certainly must mean vastly more than to know a mere title—to know merely an appellative word. This would be shallow indeed. It means to know God in his essence, in his perfections, and in his manifold and manifested relations. "I have manifested thy name" (Jno. 17: 6), means immeasurably more than the revelation of a title. Many years ago I read McWhorter's, Tahveh-Christ, where it is insisted that in this text (Ex. 6: 3) the future form of the root is used, and meaning, "I am the one that is to be," laying the basis of John's question: "Art thou (*ho erchomenos*) the Coming One?" Besides these places mentioned, these names are interchangeably used in the first chapters of Genesis. Chapter 2: 4-25 are Jahvistic but contain Elohim. Gen. 3: 1-5, in the conversation with the serpent, Elohim is substituted for Jehovah. In Gen. 4: 1, Eve says, "I have gotten a man from Jehovah," and in the twenty-fifth verse of the same chapter she says, "For Elohim hath appointed me another seed." This interchangeable

use of the words is wholly inexplicable upon the documentary theory.

Very much akin to this is that based on peculiarities of style and diction. Even the casual student of literature knows full well the uncertainties of such criteria. We all remember the interminable Junius controversy, beginning in the very days of Pitt and Frances, the reputed authors still living, their methods, style and peculiarities of diction known to living men, and yet the authorship of the Junius letters is still *lis sub judice*. Some of you remember how the Irelands imposed upon the most acute critics of the day a forged tragedy as Shakespeare's. You may and do have the supposed peculiarities of times wide apart in a single brief document of the Pentateuch. I quote a paragraph from Prof. Green: "As the Ark of the Covenant is the voucher for the unity of the Sanctuary, and for the genuineness of the Mosaic legislation concerning it, so the contents of the Ark form no inconsiderable bulwark for the unity of the Pentateuch. If monumental evidence is to be trusted, the Decalogue is Mosaic, and is preserved in Exodus 20, in the authentic form. Now, the critics assign it to the Jehovist, and claim for it the characteristics of the Jahvistic style. But it has also the peculiar phrases of Deuteronomy, and the reason annexed to the fourth commandment is based on the Elohistic account of Creation (Gen. 1: 1—2: 3). This unquestionably Mosaic document includes Elohist, Jehovist and Deuteronomist all in one." There is another question here than style, viz.: How does it happen that in connection with what Robertson Smith calls the "fundamental" part of the "First Legislation,"

there stand citations and direct reference both to the Deuteronomist and the Elohist, if they had no existence, as the critics aver, until a thousand years after the death of Moses? Kuenen himself admits the insufficiency of their method, and the uncertainty of their criteria in these words: "We can not separate two distinct documents and assign to each its share with confidence. The most we can hope for is to determine whether it is Elohist or Jahvist that lies at the base of the narrative; and *sometimes even this is doubtful.*" Dillman says, that in the theory of separate documents, he finds only a "hypothesis of perplexity," his words are: "Und kann darin nur Verlegenheits-hypothesen sehen." Bleek confesses that he is unable to separate the Elohist from the Jehovist; the *second* Elohist he could not find *at all.* One critic claims the priority of the Elohist, another the priority of the Jahvist, and so goes the battle. Of the wholly precarious nature of the process one of the boldest says: "Thus much, at least, may be safely said: the criteria of this proposed analysis are so subtle, not to say mechanical in their nature, so many purely conjectural assumptions are involved, and there is such an *entire absence of external corroborative testimony that no reliance can be placed in its conclusions where they conflict with the statements of the history itself.*" (Art. Pen., Herzog En.) What shall we say of a method, though it claim to be "scientific" never so much, when its own apostles speak of it as "subtle," "mechanical," "doubtful," "purely conjectural," "that no reliance can be placed in its conclusions," that it *fails* to do the very thing it *must* do, namely, to separate these documents and give to each

its share? Ingenious in insertion, elimination, transposition and reconstruction of the text, it surely is, but after all, a "hypothesis of perplexity." There are thousands of instances like the following. Ex. 1: 5, 7, 13 is attributed to P; verses 10, 12, 20 to J; 6, 8, 12, 15-22 to E, save where there are traces of J. Of verse 20, the first part is given to E, the second to J, and throughout are traces of R. Even the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20-23) is ascribed by some to E, by others to J, whilst Dillman, Schrader and Julicher wholly exclude J from Ex. 20. And this method is "scientific!" O potent, microscopical criticism! It pronounces its *abracadabra*, and presto! the ghostly Redactor materializes and the work is done. Minute scraps evolved through a thousand years are so dovetailed as to form a record unique and without parallel in the unbroken consecution of its substance, aim and purpose in any literature.

We now come to examine the grounds on which the claim of Mosaic authorship is supposed to rest.

OLD TESTAMENT TESTIMONY.

This covers so wide a field that we can but place the witnesses in groups and deal briefly with them. It shall be sufficiently satisfactory to show that there existed certain institutions, certain written laws, in the age of Moses and of which he was the accredited author. While this will be indubitably shown, still the critics aver that the Hebrews possessed no written law before the close of the seventh century B. C.

It is no insignificant indication that in the historical books beginning with Joshua, there is a clearly

defined historical sequence. The unity of purpose throughout is clear and distinct. The historical connection is marked and close. Joshua at once takes up the narrative dating from the death of Moses, and, as Bissell tells us, the Book of Judges is connected with Joshua by the conjunction *vav*, and beginning from the death of Joshua, with Ruth, I. and II. Samuel, covers a period to the accession of Solomon; the Book of Kings to the middle of the Exilian period; Ezra and Nehemiah to times still later. The critical assumption is that the "so-called Mosaic institutions are the post-exilian blossom of a very small Mosaic germ which is not easy to trace beyond the period of the earlier kings." We will see that it is impossible to harmonize this theory with the admitted facts of the records themselves.

Whatever is to be said of the date of the Book of Joshua, it clearly presupposes the existence of the Pentateuchal writings. This will be evident by a very cursory examination of a very few passages. Prof. Smith's objection to and rejection of the book is peculiar, and shows its marked significance in this discussion: "I exclude the Book of Joshua because it, *in all its parts, hangs closely together with the Pentateuch.*" He rejects Chronicles because it has not the character of a primary source for the earlier history, "having been written long after the reformation by Ezra." These gentlemen are wondrously facile in the exclusion of that which does not suit the exigencies of a "dearly bought method." These books recognize events and institutions in their historical sequences, contain statements, make citations of fixed Pentateuchal and Mosaic origin, and so credit them.

Joshua 1: 7, 8, contains express mention of historical events, of well known institutions, and a code of Mosaic authorship? After reminding them of the inheritance sworn unto their fathers, he exhorts: "Only be thou strong, very courageous, that thou mayst observe to do, according to *all* the law *Moses*, my servant, commanded thee." "*This book of the law* shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayst do according to all that is *written* therein." "Then Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God of Israel in Mount Ebal, as Moses, the servant of the Lord, commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in *the book of the law of Moses*, an altar of whole stones, over which no man hath lifted up any iron." "And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the *law of Moses*, which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel." In chapters 22: 5; 23: 6, there is clearly recognized the existence of a body of laws sufficiently elaborate for the government of the whole people. Chapter 24: 25, mentions the "Book of the Law of God," in which there is also a statement of the fortunes of Israel from the call of Moses and Aaron to the time when, "of the vineyards and olive yards" which they "planted not," yet "did eat." These passages testify positively to the existence of the written law before the death of Moses; that it was solemnly given, in due form, to the charge of Joshua; that he *used* it; that he *read* it at the solemnities at Ebal; that he afterwards (8: 34) read "all the words of law," "before all the congregation of Israel," not omitting (verse 35) so much as "*a word of all that Moses commanded.*" Truly, Joshua *does* "hang

closely together with the Pentateuch." Joshua without the Pentateuch would be meaningless, so great is his dependence upon it. Direct reference is made to Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy in surprisingly numerous instances. There must, therefore, in the time of Joshua, have existed a body of sacred writings capable of identification with the Pentateuch in its present form. This the Book of Joshua presupposes and even unequivocally alleges. The sole escape of the so-called scientific method is to stamp the book with falsehood or exclude it as a witness, as the Scotch Professor has done. The wildest of the theorists concedes the honest endeavors of the authors "to set forth the facts of the history," and after an abatement of the "embellishments," "repetitions and obscurities," the record is "in the main trustworthy." (Toy H. of Is.)

The Book of Kings, completed not later than the time of Jeremiah, bears full and explicit testimony to the existence of a body of laws of Mosaic origin; a large body of statutes, judgments, commandments and testimonies; that it had long been in existence as the accepted legislation of Israel; so accepted in every period from the days in which Moses lived through and during the times of the Judges, of David and Solomon, and in both the Northern and Southern Kingdoms after Solomon. I have no space to cite in full all that bears directly on these statements, but enough to demonstrate their truthfulness. In 2 Kings 22: 7, 8, it is recounted how Hilkiah the priest found the Book of the Law in the Lord's house. This has been cited with great emphasis to show the post-exilian origin of the law. The passage presupposes its

prior existence, and even Kuenen concedes that it does not prove its post-exilic origin. The very reverse is true in fact. Ascending the stream from Josiah through Manasseh to the reformation of Hezekiah, quite ninety years, we find the recognition (2 Kings 28: 4) of the obligation of the Deuteronomic law, the same law found in the temple; "the Book of the Law" mentioned, and found just where it should be by the Deuteronomic requirement (Deut. 31: 9, 25). Passing still upward from the reformation of Hezekiah, in which there was a full recognition of "the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses," we come to Joash, one hundred and twenty years earlier, and we find the same recognition of the Mosaic code (14: 6) in an appeal to that "which is written in the Book of the law of Moses," and the words are a direct citation from Deut. 24: 5, *thus proving the existence of the Deuteronomic law more than two hundred years before Josiah, the date the critics give.*

"The king when he heard the words of the Book of the Law rent his clothes" (2 Kings 22: 10, 11). "*Our fathers* obeyed not the words of this book" (verse 13). The fathers certainly, upon the critical theory, did not disobey that which they did not possess. "He read in their ears all the words of the Book of the Covenant which was found in the house of the Lord—to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this Book." "Make ye a passover to Jehovah your God, according to *what is written in this book* of the covenant." "And like unto him (verse 25) there was no king (Josiah) before him, that turned to the Lord with all his might *according to the law of*

Moses" (18: 36, 37). "But the Lord who brought you up out of the land of Egypt." "And the statutes, and the ordinances, and the laws, and the commandments which he wrote for you." "And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel into Assyria . . . because they did not obey the voice of Jehovah their God, and transgressed his covenant, all which *Moses* the servant of Jehovah had commanded" (1 Kings 2: 1-9). We have David's solemn and gravely beautiful charge to Solomon: "I go the way of all the earth: be thou strong therefore and show thyself a man; and keep the charge of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies *as it is written in the law of Moses.*" This was given *four hundred years before the date of the Deuteronomic code as fixed by the critics.* You have in this very partial induction, the phrases, "the law," "the book, "the Book of the Covenant," "ways," "statutes," "commandments," "judgments," "testimonies," "the law of Moses," "the Book of the law of Moses," indicating an elaborate system of legislation, "all of his good word which he spake by the hand of Moses his servant" (1 Kings 8: 55). This evidence is direct, and can be met by the negative critics in one of two ways: either by charging interpolation or falsification. There is no other.

NEHEMIAH AND EZRA.

We take next in order the last of the consecutive historical books of the Old Testament. It is assumed by the negative-criticism that a large part of the Pentateuch, and also the Elohistic documents, originated

in the days of Ezra. It will appear, however, that there existed a definite body of written laws *before* Ezra, and both Ezra and Nehemiah date the legislation *from the days of Moses*, and they are explicit as to the existence of the Priest-code, and as to its being a constituent part of the Book of the Law. They recognize Pentateuchal events, which would have been impossible, save upon the actual existence of the records. With them the Book of the Law had been in existence from the days of Moses. In Nehemiah 3: 12, 8: 1-3, 10: 29, we have, "the law of Moses," "the man of God," the Book of the law of Moses," "God's law given by Moses, the servant of God." In chapter 9: 13, 14, after giving the details of Israel's bondage and deliverance, these words follow: "Thou camest down upon *Mount Sinai*, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws and good statutes and commandments; and commandest them precepts, statutes and laws *by the hand of Moses* thy servant." *Eighty years before* Ezra, Jeshua and Zerubbabel builded an altar, and offered thereon burnt offerings, "*according to what was written in the law of Moses.*" Now, it is to be borne in mind that the law of burnt-offering, according to the classification of the critics, was "*peculiar*" to the Priest-code which they declare had *no existence till Ezra*. Ezra testifies that it was in force and regarded as an *ancient law eighty years before* his own time. As chapter 9: 13, 14, dates from Mount Sinai and Moses, so also chapter 1: 7, 8 dates from Moses. "We have not kept the commandments, nor the statutes, nor the judgments, which thou commandest thy servant Moses." Ezra (7: 6) is called "a ready scribe in the

law of God," verse 10, "a scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord and of his statutes to Israel," verse 12, "a scribe of the law of God." All of which shows conclusively that Ezra, in Babylonia, was engaged in the study of the written law, long prior to the time that he came to Jerusalem. This, in connection with the other fact, that both Ezra and Nehemiah declare that the law was not in process of formation, but was already in existence and had been for years, and indubitably the work of Moses, is fatal to the theory of the negative critics, who allege that the legislation was unknown in the Mosaic period. Yet it is still Moses, and "the theatre is the desert."

THE PROPHETIC BOOKS.

This problem, says Kuenen, is "historical." Geo. Rawlinson says that "in every historical inquiry it is possible to pursue our researches in two ways. We may either trace the stream of time upwards, and pursue history to its earliest source, or we may reverse the process, and beginning at the fountain-head, follow down the course of events in chronological order to our day." The former is "more philosophical," the latter is "the clearer and simpler of the two." We accept the first, not because more philosophical, but the clearer and simpler in the case in hand. We must keep in mind that the "negative-criticism" makes the Priest-code and Elohistic records post-exilian, placing them in the days of Ezra (444 B. C.), and the Deuteronomist as late as Josiah (621 B. C.), thus making impossible the Mosaic origin and authorship. We expect to show that certain phenomena of these books—continual reference to the Torah; the mention

of events; by actual citations; and by the unequivocal recognition of laws placed by the critics in the Priest-code and peculiar to it, that these documents (known as Mosaic) must have existed centuries *before* Ezra, and therefore, that the falsity of the theory is a case made out.

In the four chapters of Malachi (440 B. C.) there are eight distinct references to the Pentateuch in its present form. "The law of Moses" (4: 4) given "in Horeb," "for all Israel," "with statutes and judgments," is definitely recognized. The desert was the theatre. The passage has direct reference to Lev. 26: 46, viz: "These are the statutes, and judgments, and laws, which the Lord made between him and the children of Israel in Mount Sinai (a peak in the range of Horeb) by the hand of Moses." In the books of Haggai and Zechariah (520 B. C.) there are allusions to a written Torah existing for years prior to their times, and distinct allusions to Pentateuchal historical events, with eleven direct references in which every book of the Pentateuch save Genesis is included. Allusion is made to the feast of tabernacles (established in Lev. 23: 34, 43); to the mitre on the head of the high priest (Zech. 3: 5; Ex. 29: 28; Lev. 8: 9); the golden candlestick (Zech. 4: 2; Ex. 25: 37), and in 3: 1, 8; 6: 11, "Joshua the son of Josedech the high priest" is mentioned. Still, the scientific method, "dearly bought," makes all of these things, with the high priest, contrivances of Ezra, nearly a hundred years later. Wellhausen calls the high priest a "novelty of the exile."

In the early part of the Babylonian captivity we have the prophet Ezekiel, who not only makes

repeated mention of the Mosaic Torah, but even of those laws referred by the critics to Ezra or to the prophet himself. There are twenty-two references to the Pentateuch, no one of the books being excepted. In 20: 10-15 he mentions the bondage, the Exodus, the wilderness, the perpetually recurring frame-work "of the Book of the Law," and makes God say: "And I gave them my statutes and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them." Then the prophet charges, in common, as we shall see, with all the others, the apostasy of Israel, their gross deflection from a known code of laws, and known for centuries back. "They rebelled against me in the wilderness"—"they walked not in my statutes, and they despised my judgments." Then God "in the wilderness" threatened to "consume them," and that he would not "bring them" into the land "flowing with milk and honey." Is this fiction?—historical embellishment? One other passage: "From my youth up even till now have I not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn in pieces; neither came there abominable flesh into my mouth" (4: 14). In Ex. 23: 31 we have, "Neither shall ye eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field;" and in Lev. 17: 15, "Every soul that eateth that which *died of itself*, or which *was torn* with beasts," etc.; in Deut. 14: 3, "Thou shalt not eat any *abominable thing*." In the year 575 B. C., *at least one hundred and fifty years before Ezra came to Jerusalem from Babylonia, these Pentateuchal prohibitions were observed by the prophets.* Everywhere there is a direct recognition of the events and legislation of the middle books of the Pentateuch,

and this involves a palpable denial of the negative theory.

Jeremiah from 629 to 589 B. C., makes many references to the Torah, to the Exodus, and explicitly recognizes a covenant God made with them when he brought them out of Egypt (31: 31-33), and in 34: 13, 14, that in that day when he brought them out of Egypt he made a covenant, saying: "At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother a Hebrew, who hath been sold unto thee; and when he hath served thee six years thou shalt let him go free from thee." This is found in Ex. 21: 2, Deut. 15: 12, and is associated by the prophets with the "coming out of Egypt" (verse 13). Then we have "my law," "my statutes," "my testimonies," "out of Egypt," and so inextricably wedding the legislation with the historical framework of the Exodus. One more brief yet remarkable passage. In 4: 23 the language of Gen. 1: 2 occurs. Says Jeremiah: "I beheld the earth, and lo, it was without form and void." Gen. 1: 2 reads, "And the earth was without form and void." The Elohistic account of creation must have been in the prophetic possession, yet Graf declares that this passage was post-exilic, which theory is stamped with falsity, as Jeremiah uses it nearly *two centuries before the exile*. Graf's words are: "I must maintain that the whole of the first Elohist history, as well as law, is *post-exilian*." How came the prophet to be possessed of it two centuries before it existed?

A whole group of prophets must be overlooked whose testimony is univocal. We must be content with a single other one. In Hosea, 785-725 B. C., there are many references to Pentateuchal law and

historical incidents. In 9: 10 we read: "But they went to Baal-peor, and separated themselves unto their shame; and their abominations were according as they loved." The position of these words shows that the prophet connected them with Egypt and the Exodus. The passage is directly connected with Num. 25: 3-5, which reads, "And Israel joined himself unto Baal-peor; and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel. And Moses said unto the judges of Israel, Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baal-peor." According to Wellhausen, Num. 25 belongs to the Priest-code which he makes *post-Exilian*. If this be true, Hosea quotes it *two hundred years before it existed*. Another very remarkable treatment of a Pentateuchal event is found in 12: 3, 4: "He took his brother by the heel in the womb, and by his strength he had power with God: yea, he had power over the angel and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him; he found him in Bethel and there he spake with us." This is based upon three Pentateuchal passages: Gen. 25: 25; 32: 24-30; 28: 11-20. In the first, "And his hand took hold of Esau's heel;" in the second, (32: 24), "For as a prince hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed." In the third (28: 11-20), "This is none other but the house of God (Bethel) and this is the gate of heaven." This second passage according to Wellhausen is Elohistic, and is post-exilian, and still it is quoted between the years 788-725 B. C., that is, *two centuries and a half before it existed*. This fact presents an insuperable objection to the critical theory of Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen and others, and yet Duhm is willing to say: "Nothing is

simpler than the theory of Graf." It was only needful to place a single original authority, which is generally called "the fundamental document," by others "the Book of Origins," as the composition of the first Elohist . . . in the post-exilian times, in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, in order, with *one blow* to put the "Mosaic period out of the world." So it would if the theory of the "fundamental," "post-exilic document" were only true, which it is not. Jeremiah 626-580, Isaiah 758-705, and Hosea 785-725 B. C., each make a citation from the first Elohist, *who could not therefore have been post-exilic.* All these prophets refer to the Levitical Code, as for instance, Hosea in three distinct passages refers to the burnt-offering and sin-offering of the Pentateuchal law, which by the critics are declared to be "peculiar" to a post-exilian Priest-code. This fact indubitably proves that both the "fundamental Elohistic document" and the Priest-code were in existence centuries before Ezra and Nehemiah. So this "one blow" fails to knock the "Mosaic period out of the world."

LEVITICAL CODE.

We come now to look at the last result of Pentateuchal redaction. The Levitical code is the third in the stage of development, according to the theorists. It is composed, according to Wellhausen, of passages from Genesis; Leviticus almost entire; Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua, a compilation from the whole Hexateuch in its present form, which originated and was published in the time of Ezra (B. C. 444). If this date be accepted it follows that the Mosaic authorship is impossible. "On the face of

the *whole* legislation, of course," says Kuenen, "we read that the theatre is the *desert;* Israel is encamped there; the settlement of Canaan is in the future." If these *are* facts, and they are so recorded, can this legislation be given so late a date as Ezra? Is this assumption consistent with the positive claims, with the internal and incidental indications of the code itself? Twenty-one out of the twenty-seven chapters of Leviticus open with "the Lord called" and "the Lord spake unto Moses." This sets up the positive claim that a message was received from Jehovah by Moses and that out of the Tabernacle of the congregation. Unless this be sheer fiction the post-exilic date is impossible. Many circumstances inextricably associate the Levitical code with the Exodus and its immediate consequent state. In the Levitical law of leprosy (which is peculiar to the Priest-code), the leper shall have his habitation "*without the camp*" and when he is cleansed, "he shall come into *the camp*" (14: 8), "and shall tarry abroad out of his *tent* seven days." Could this be the historical setting of Ezra's time (when this code originated), a thousand years after Israel's nomadic life had ended? The unclean were put "*without the camp*" (Num. 5: 2-4 and 12, 14, 15). Miriam became leprous and was "shut out from the *camp* seven days." Now, it is to be kept in mind, that the critics make the law of leprosy peculiar to the Priest-code dated in Ezra's time, yet here it is connected with Miriam and the camp *a thousand years earlier*. In chapter four there is a carefully detailed process in regard to the bullock slain as a sin offering, and closes with these words (verse 21): "And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp and

burn him as he burned the first bullock." In 6: 8-13, the law of burnt offering is stated, and after certain details it is ordered by the priest: "And he shall put off his garments and carry forth the ashes *without the camp* into a clean place" (verse 11). Do not forget that by Wellhausen and others these offerings are held to be "peculiar" to the priestly code, dating not earlier than Ezra, yet by the very terms of the ritual they are indissolubly connected with the tent life of Israel. So, again, another law peculiar to the Priest-code—the scape-goat (Azazel) of Lev. 16: 8, 26. The goat having been sent into the wilderness, "He that let go the goat for the scape-goat shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterwards *come into the camp.* And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin-offering, whose blood was brought to make atonement in the Holy place, *shall one carry forth without the camp.*" Again in the ritual concerning leprosy: "The priest shall go forth out of the camp" (14: 13). Once more, Num. 19: 11-22, describes in full purification by the ashes of a red heifer: the heifer is to be "*brought forth without the camp,*" and being burned, a clean person shall gather up the ashes of the heifer and lay them up *without the camp* (verses 3, 7). I have selected instances allowed by all to belong to the Priest-code, and peculiar to that code, and not earlier than Ezra, yet every one of them is connected with the nomadic tent life of Israel by positive ritualistic requirements. The critics are greatly disturbed upon occasion. Robertson Smith says: "It is very noteworthy and, on the traditiona view, quite inexplicable, that the Mosaic sanctuary of the Ark is never mentioned in the Deuteronomic

code." It *is* mentioned Deut. 10: 1-8. But in regard to the Priest-code it is very noteworthy and, on the anti-traditional view, quite inexplicable that the Levitical code gives minute and elaborate instructions for building the ark *one hundred and fifty years after its destruction* with the first temple under Nebuchadnezzar. We are to accept the tabernacle and its furniture so elaborately described, as fiction, pure and simple. But in the light of the historical setting of the code, the critical allegation that there are no traces of Pentateuchal law in the historical and other books of the Old Testament till centuries after Moses, involving the denial of the Deuteronomic law before Josiah, or the Priest-code before Ezra, can not be accepted. The theory is infinitely improbable. Nehemiah declares the existence of a Mosaic code centuries prior to his own and Ezra's day. Neh. 9: 8-15, he mentions the call of Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees, the bondage in Egypt, the signs and wonders upon Pharaoh, the passage of the Red Sea, the destruction of the Egyptians, the cloudy pillar and pillar of fire, and then says (verses 13 14): "Thou camest down also on Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy Holy Sabbath, and commandest them precepts, statutes and laws by the hand of Moses thy servant." The same authorship—the same historical framework everywhere. Is it fiction? Is it historical "embellishment" to impose a fraud upon ages of peoples? What purpose was to be subserved by affixing the name of Moses to a document a thousand years after his death? And on what ground, save that he

had been a divinely empowered legislator, that he gave an elaborate code, standing at the summit of the legislation of the race, would they have desired so to use his name? Yet these are precisely the things that the destructive criticism denies. The theory is environed by endless improbabilities. It makes the whole Jewish race to the time of Christ conspire to fasten a gross deception upon the world, which Christ and his apostles subsequently abet, as we shall see.

THE DIRECT CLAIM.

This problem is historical, says Kuenen. And yet this whole school of critics has suspended the matter upon a subjective conjecture. De Wette says in regard to the method, that "The only thing lacking to make it attractive is truth. Whether from a dread of individualism inspired by the Hegelian philosophy, a predilection for development and self-impelled struggle upward or a love of paradox, they have linked the history of Hebraism not with the *fixed* point of the grand creations of Moses, but have suspended their beginnings on nothing." They give us a historical reconstruction as well as a textual and contextual shaping to suit the exigencies of a theory, the alleged reasons for which are either false or trivial. The claim of the Pentateuch is direct and specific. Out of twenty-seven chapters of Leviticus, nineteen of these open with a specific declaration of a message delivered unto the great Law-giver with this formula, "The Lord spake unto Moses." Numbers, with the same formula, locates the scene in the wilderness of Sinai. Fifteen-sixteenths of the verses of Deuteronomy, by

actual count, are attributed to Moses. The claim by the records themselves is plain and positive. After Israel's victory in Rephedim, recorded in Ex. 17: 8-16, in the fourteenth verse we have this specific instruction: "Write this for a memorial *in a book* and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua." This book is indubitably that spoken of as Mosaic in Num. 21: 14, "Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord, what he did in the Red Sea and the brooks of Arnon." The Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20-24) which it is claimed was not written by Moses, and did exist in its present form but belonged to a much later period, is positively declared to be Mosaic in these words (Exod. 24: 34): "And Moses came and told the people *all the words* of the Lord, and *all the judgments:* and all the people answered with one voice, *All the words* which the Lord hath said will we do. And Moses *wrote all* the words of the Lord." "And he took the Book of the Covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient" (verse 7). Exod. 34: 27, 28. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel. And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; and he did neither eat bread nor drink water. And he *wrote* upon the tables the words of the Covenant, the ten commandments." Robertson Smith allows that Moses wrote the "Ten Words." Dr. Toy says that he wrote none, or if so, the record is lost. Does he mean that the two tables on which Moses wrote are lost? It is just as directly affirmed

that Moses did other writing as that he wrote the ten words. Then comes the itinerary of Israel out of the land of Egypt under Moses and Aaron (Num. 33: 2) where we have these words: "And Moses *wrote* their goings out according to their journeys *by the commandment* of the Lord." But the "scientific method" denies this whole matter, denying any historical credence to the records;—that the list of stations was written long after the events occurred; that we can not rely on their correctness, and this, in the face of the record itself, which claims that the list was written by an eye-witness and a principal actor in the alleged events. At the touch of the critical finger, not words and clauses, but whole chapters are swept away, books recast and reconstructed at the demand, not of historical evidence, but of a "dogmatic presupposition." What confidence is to be placed in a document written a thousand years after the events narrated, whilst claiming to be the work of an eye-witness? A claim so lying, if the negative-criticism is to be believed, is set up by a book marked by the loftiest moral tone known to the race. Surely, the legs of the lame are unequal.

We come now to a passage in a book that opens with: "These be the words which *Moses* spake unto all Israel." The Book of Deuteronomy is everywhere stamped with these and like words, "Moses spake," "Moses commanded," "the Lord said to Moses," and thirty-seven times in the Book the name of the Lawgiver is connected authoritatively with the literary form and substance of the book. Chapter 31: 9, 24, declares unequivocally the Mosaic authorship of the Book: "And Moses *wrote* this law, and *delivered* it

unto the priests, the sons of Levi." At the end of every seven years, at the time of the feast of the tabernacle, when all Israel should appear before the Lord in the place chosen by him, it was required thus: "Thou shalt *read* this law before *all Israel* in their hearing." In verse 22, it is said, "Moses wrote a song," and in verse 24, "And it came to pass that when Moses had made an end of writing the *words of this law in a book*, until they were finished;" "Take (verse 25) this Book of the Law and put it in the side of the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord your God for a witness against thee." Then follows the song (31: 22*ff*), directly credited to Moses, full of splendor in diction and substances. The conception of God is at once lofty and infinitely tender as the poet describes his dealing with Israel. "He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness; He led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye. As an eagle stirreth up her nest, flutters over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings; so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange God with him." So sang the "Barbarian" leader of the "Nomads of Goshen!" Moses not only *wrote*, delivered and read—but wrote in a book—to the finish. In Deut. 28: 58, 61, this writing of Moses is spoken of in these phrases: "All the words (verse 58) of this law that are written in this book," and in verse 61: "Every plague which is not written in the Book of the Law." So, again, 29: 20, 27: "And all the curses that are written in this Book." Once more, Deut. 33: 10, "If thou hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this Book of the Law." This Book of the

Law contains "words," "commandments," "statutes," and "curses," all of which Moses wrote to the end by the commandment of the Lord. So the record itself directly and positively avers, yet upon the ground of uncertain and unsatisfactory verbal criticism, we are to regard these positive averments as graceless fictions, framed for fraudulent purposes.

Aside from these positive claims of Mosaic origin there are certain internal and unconscious indications of the Mosaic authorship. We first examine that portion of the Pentateuch which is largely put in the days of Josiah, and if this reference be true, it is not Mosaic, in form or substance, language or style. But can this hypothesis be maintained on grounds of true historical criticism? Is the method as claimed by the critics "scientific?" The whole Book of Deuteronomy is stamped with the memories of Egypt: the bondage, the deliverance, the march, the land of promise, became at once the ground and motive of its legislation, gives hue and form to the entire body. It is said by Bissell: "It is the Egypt of Sethos I., Ramesis I. and II., and of Menepthes that has left its indelible impression on the Pentateuch." So great Egyptologists testify of the other Books also. Says Lenormant, "Exodus bears unmistakable marks of historical truth and agrees most happily with the state of things at the time of Merenptah." Meyer: "The narrative of the Exodus of the Hebrews rests upon certain knowledge of Succoth and its border fortresses." "The descriptions (Wiedemann) of the relations of both lands (Egypt and Syria) are very minute. In all these places we find a sure knowledge of Egyptian affairs as well as geographical points, as in the descrip-

tion of private relations." "This narrative (Gen. 12: 10 *seq.*) is real Egyptian" (Ebers). This after awhile we will see to be abundantly true. Deuteronomy, in its unity of structure, plainly shows the hand of one mighty master. The Deuteronomic law is inseparably interwoven with the previous legislation and with the history of the Jewish people. It shows unbroken continuity from first to last, and its cultus, to adopt Smend's words, "is by no means at variance with the character of Leviticus." It is said by Bleek, in confirmation of this view: "It may be held as certain that the Deuteronomic laws together with the addresses they contain, as, indeed, the whole of Deuteronomy from the beginning was written with reference to the preceding history of the people and the legislation of Moses, and to continue and supplement it. And it is decidedly false to hold that what it contains is older than the foregoing books and their legislation." Dillman says: "There is everywhere manifest the same spirit, the same language and the same purpose throughout." Delitzich: "The style of Deuteronomy marks it off indubitably as something unique and entire in itself. Deuteronomy to its close is cast in one mold. The historical connections, conclusions, transitions and statements have the same coloring as the addresses. Precisely the same literary individuality 'confronts' us throughout the whole Book. And yet the 'scientific' theorists claim that Deuteronomy is mere patchwork, made of many-colored scraps picked here and there through a thousand years." Its "literary peculiarities," says Kleinert, "are at the same time 'peculiarities of its (historical) framework.'" Taking the law in its historical setting, we purpose to show that

the internal indications are in perfect accord with the prefatory statements: "These are the words (1: 1) which *Moses* spake," and "This is the law which *Moses* set before the children of Israel" (4: 44); "*Moses* called unto all Israel, and said to the children of Israel" (5: 1). Kuenen admits that "the legislative activity of Moses involves the *essential unity* of the Torah," and that "we are justified in regarding the ordinances of the Exodus-Deuteronomy as *the several parts of a single body of legislation*, and in comparing them with one another as such." We state the issue in Kuenen's own words: "Either the laws really came from Moses and the desert, or they are merely put into his mouth, and the desert and so forth belong to their literary form of presentment." The latter hypothesis he adopts, and that these laws were "separated from each other by a space, not of years, but centuries." His main reason is that such a body of legislation could not have grown up in so limited a period as that allowed. But this theory acquires significance only by the total elimination of the supernatural element from the historical development of this people. The moral elevation of the Torah itself forever excludes the deception and imposture contained in the words of the theory, "put into his mouth," and that the assumed historical framework is a mere "form of presentment," totally fictitious in character, is equally excluded. The problem is historical, say the critics, and are not these connections and relations "historical?" The theory is beyond the pale of possibility. The name of Moses is thirty-seven times connected with the literary form and substance of the Book. Fifteen-sixteenths of the verses are directly credited to

him. The place of legislation is directly declared to be "in the wilderness" (1: 1). The writer speaks of himself as one of those "brought forth out of the land of Egypt" (1: 27). He makes the historical dependence of his law stand out definitely by his continuous appeal to them by "All that the Lord your God *did for you in Egypt before your eyes.*" Is it credible that this framework would have been adopted centuries *after* the events occurred? (Lev. 4: 34; 2: 30.) The Deuteronomic "testimony" and "statutes" and "judgments" "which Moses spake" "unto the children" are connected with the Exodus (4: 45-46). "And this is the law (so it reads) that Moses set before the children of Israel: These are the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments which Moses spake unto the children of Israel after they came forth out of Egypt, *On this side* of Jordan in the valley over against Beth-peor, in the land of Sichon . . . who dwelt at Heshbon," and this, by the way, flatly contradicts Smith's theory that the writer "lived in Western Palestine." The very terms of the statement show the recent and not remote connection of the legislation with the Exodus. The next chapter puts this beyond question. "And Moses called (5: 1-3) all Israel and said unto them: Hear, O Israel, the statutes and judgments which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and keep and do them. The Lord our God made a Covenant *with* us *in Horeb.* The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even *us, who all of us are here alive this day.*" The legislator is one who was a sharer of the Exodus, a participator of the stupendous scenes in Horeb. And these statements are mere fictions, introduced as

a "literary form of presentment," so the "advance thinkers" tell us. The theory is incredible, and the statement of Kuenen must be true, that "the laws came from Moses and the desert." Continually formulas like these occur, showing the legislative setting of Deuteronomy: "Out of the land of Egypt," "a servant in the land of Egypt," "bondmen in Egypt," "the house of bondage," "from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt." These phrases occur scores of times; by actual count, forty-four times, in at least thirty of the thirty-seven chapters, these are given as the positive setting of the Deuteronomic law. This account given of itself has been accepted as credible for centuries by the most learned and diligent investigators. To-day the only theory opposing the date and authorship is based on no shred of *historical* evidence, but upon unsatisfactory and precarious *critical* data. It is impossible to give Deuteronomy a post-exilian or indeed any other date than the traditional one, without stamping a fraud upon every page of the record. What particular force such a claim possesses, set up centuries after Moses, it is not easy to discover. That he received messages from Jehovah, in the wilderness, in the desert, on Horeb, whilst Israel was living a tent-life, and before the settlement of Canaan, is positively declared, but not one of these things is true on the critical theory; the legislation has, therefore, a framework of fraud and fiction. Is such a method of law-making thinkable? The post-exilic origin of Deuteronomy is impossible on other grounds. Whilst there are more than two score of direct references to the Egypt of the Exodus, the book is wholly silent as to series of crises in the history of a great people occurring prior to the

date of Deuteronomy fixed by the critics. The most remarkable events in the fortunes of the Hebrew people are not even hinted at. This determines the Pentateuchal question. "The view taken of Deuteronomy," says De Wette, "is for the criticism of the Pentateuch decisive."

EVIDENCE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It must be kept distinctly in mind that it is absolutely declared by the Old Testament records that certain things were written by Moses. The list of the itinerary of Israel is given in Num. 33, the Book of the Covenant embracing by critical concession Exod. 20-23, Exod. 34: 27. Deuteronomy 31: 9, 24-36, gives this a Mosaic origin. The Book of Deuteronomy makes specific claim to Mosaic origin, whilst the middle Books of the Pentateuch, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers record many facts in the history of Israel, and are pre-supposed by the Mosaic legislation, and form its framework, as we have amply seen. Egypt, the wildernesss, the Exodus, are continually associated with the Pentateuchal legislation. We now come to an examination of the evidence given by Christ and the apostles as to the validity and credibility of the Mosaic origin of these sacred Books. The force of the testimony can not be overlooked—it is decisive. If these books came into being a thousand or more years after the date claimed, and by other than the hand of Moses; full of forgeries and fictions; bearing upon their face a falsehood in the claim of Mosaic authorship, it is wholly inconceivable that either Christ or the apostles would recognize their historical credibility

or accept the Mosaic origin. The force of this testimony is conceded by Kuenen in these words: "*We must either cast aside as worthless our dearly bought scientific method, or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament in the domain of the exegesis of the Old.*" (Prop. & Pro. in Is. p. 478.) Mark the concession. If the New Testament is admitted into the domain of the exegesis of the Old, the "scientific method is worthless"—so avers the master by whom the negative-criticism swears. Kuenen claims that the problem is "historical," and that "every one knows the sources which must be consulted," and yet, when the exigencies of the theory require, coolly repudiates the sole known historical data and builds upon the ground of "dogmatic pre-suppositions"—his critical structure baseless as a dream. The critics never hesitate "to cast aside" whatever stands in the way of their pretentious critical assumptions. They reject, interpolate, reconstruct and break down historic forms upon the basis of no accredited fact. Kuenen's statement grants that the scientific method can be maintained only by discrediting the New Testament. *If* credited, the theory is "worthless." This is a confession, in plain words, of the logical outcome of the whole matter. It demands that the entire Book be discredited and that doubt and distrust be cast upon the plainest utterances of Christ. To these critics much is "fallacious," and more fictitious—a book whose history is forged in order to foist a legal system upon a people in the interests of a corrupt priesthood; and Christ is represented as perpetuating this fraud. "In a sense," says Prof. Toy, "it matters little to us whether it was Moses or somebody

else who had the chief part in it," but it does matter to us when a record, held to be inspired, bears a tissue of falsehood on its face, and so imperiling the credibility of the whole. We shall for the sake of clearness group the New Testament evidence under two heads.

THE RECOGNITION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AS CREDIBLE HISTORY.

The facts of Old Testament history recognized by the New, are intimately associated with its teaching in their ethical and spiritual significations. They illustrate and enforce the supremest lessons of the Master and the apostles. I can barely refer to the passages recognizing the historical credibility and Mosaic origin:

1. The Story of Creation, by Christ and Paul. Matt. 19: 45; 1 Tim. 2: 13, 14.

2. The Patriarchal History, embracing leading and critical events in the lives of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, Hagar and Rebecca. Rom. 4: 1-3, 11; Gal. 4: 22-31; 1 Pet. 3: 16. The letter to the Hebrews—a plea is based upon the case of Esau recorded in Genesis.

3. The Story of Noah and the Flood, recognized by Christ, Matt. 24: 37-39; twice by Peter, 1 Pet. 3: 20; 2 Pet. 2: 5.

4. The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, by the Savior, Luke 17: 28-32, and by Peter, 2 Pet. 2: 6, 7, and in Jude 7, 11. This account found only in the Pentateuch.

5. The Calling of Moses. Mark 12: 26.

6. The Exodus. Acts 13: 17, 18; 1 Cor. 10: 1-10.

Many of the incidents of the Exodus and itinerary are alluded to: The brazen serpent, Jno. 3: 14; the manna, Jno. 5: 32. These facts acquire significance only as we study them in relation to the fundamental facts of Christianity. Paul conceives of these Old Testament facts as he does of the historic facts that form the living basis of Christ's religion, the life, death and resurrection of our Lord. That these men believed that all these events took place at the time and as described by the author of the Pentateuch is simply indubitable. They manifest, in the use they make of the facts, their unquestioning belief in their historical verity. There is more than belief in their credibility; they are regarded as parts and stages of a development in a vast remedial purpose, which purpose runs in unbroken consecution through all the sacred Books. In a speech delivered at Antioch in Pisidia, by Paul, recorded Acts 13: 17-33, this is strikingly manifested. Paul shows the epochs in the unfolding of a mighty purpose, and that all of the facts are associated in an inseparable unity—an indissoluble relationship. The significance and possibility of the New Testament facts absolutely depend upon those of the Old. Look at their order of sequence and necessary relationship. From 17-22 we have the chosen race, their elevation, their bondage in Egypt, the deliverance and the Exodus, the forty years in the wilderness, the destruction of the Canaanites and the division of the land; the Judges for four hundred and fifty years till Samuel the Prophet; the elevation of Saul to kingship during forty years; his removal; the accession of David to the throne, and then follows the pregnant statement: "Of this man's seed hath

God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus." He then speaks of John as the Master's herald, and follows with these words (26-31): "Men *and* brethren, children of the stock of Abraham, and whosoever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this salvation sent. For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath-day, they have fulfilled *them* in condemning *him*. And though they found no cause of death *in him*, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took *him* down from the tree, and laid *him* in a sepulchre. But God raised him from the dead: and he was seen many days of them which came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people."

All these facts of Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, as cited by Paul, and the facts concerning Christ, are the interwoven elements of one vast, sublime purpose, revealed in "the word of this salvation" sent unto "the children of the stock of Abraham." And all this is a luminous attestation of the full and accurate historical character of the Pentateuch. And these books, so attested, distinctly claim a Mosaic authorship. The New Testament recognizes the trustworthiness of the Old; this Rationalism denies, because fatal to its "dearly bought" method.

THE ACTUAL RECOGNITION AND ASSERTION OF THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP.

Christ and the New Testament clearly recognize certain well-defined epochs in the history of redemption in the Bible—distinct administrations, variously described as Law and Grace, Letter and Spirit, covenants old and new. There have been two periods of distinctly organized existence of those called of God; the head of one was Moses, the head of the other is Christ. These two names became the accepted expression of two great systems or religious cults. Now, to the ordinary mind it is inexplicable why Christ and the apostles should hold the name of Moses as the synonym of a cult lying at the very basis of the wonderful Jewish civilization, if, as the negative criticism holds, the entire body of Jewish legislation was a thousand years after the days of Moses. It is even denied by some that he wrote the "Ten Words." This, Prof. Smith charily concedes. And that his name is held as the synonym of a great system is amply demonstrable. In John 1: 14, we have this antithesis of names and systems: "The law was given by Moses; grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." In Acts 15: 21 he is spoken of as the representative of a system of laws: "And after that they had held their peace, James answered, saying, For *Moses* of old time hath in every city them that preach *him*, *being read* in the synagogues every Sabbath day." And still one of our critics declares that, "If he wrote any commandments, the record has been lost." And the critic continues: "In after years it became the fashion to think of him as the author of

almost all the religious customs of the land; as a divinely appointed lawgiver." Why he should have been so regarded is not altogether clear upon the critical theory. Christ himself represents Moses as the expression of a whole era of development. "They have *Moses* and the prophets;" "if they hear not *Moses*," and like words. This is still further manifested by expressions like these: "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the *law of Moses*, and in the prophets, and in the psalms concerning me" (Luke 24: 44). "And Philip findeth Nathanael and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom *Moses in the law* and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph." By the law, are only the Ten Words meant? Surely not. A case in point: Deuteronomy 18: 15 is quoted in a speech of the Apostle Peter: "*Moses* said truly unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you." Paul also recognizes the name as the expression of an epoch of history, not only of Israel, but of the race, when he says, "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses" (Rom. 5: 14). So also his leadership in the Exodus. 1 Cor. 10: 1-2: "Moreover, brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea and were all baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Paul would not have them ignorant of that which the "dearly-bought scientific method" pronounces sheer fiction, used for the purpose of "historical embellishment." Paul was indeed as "one born out of due season" before the scientific method,

sitting upon the egg of conjecture, hatched the negative criticism. These men give us the reproduction of an old story. "Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." I now make a special point of the explicit testimony of Jesus to the historical credibility of the Pentateuch. That Christ held, as all had done for centuries, that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch is beyond question. When he says, Matt. 23: 2, "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," he means to assert as a matter of veracious history the old-time supremacy of Moses in Israel. "To offer the gift that Moses commanded" (Matt. 7: 4); or (Mark 7: 10), "For this cause hath Moses given you circumcision." "If any man receives circumcision on the Sabbath day, *that the* law of Moses may not be broken" (John 7: 22, 23). "*Moses* said, Honor thy father and thy mother." Christ, referring to the scene recorded in Ex. 3: 12, called forth by the question of the Sadducees, definitely speaks of *the Book of Moses*, in perfect accord with Ex. 17: 13, where God said: "Write this for a memorial *in a book*." "And there came to him Sadducees which say that there is no resurrection of the dead; and they asked him saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us," and he answered: "And as touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the *Book of Moses*, how in the bush (Ex. 3: 6) God spake unto him saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Mark 12: 19-26; Matt. 23: 23-32; Luke 20: 27-28). It is incredible that either Christ or the New Testament writers in using the phrases embodied in these citations, that Moses said, Moses wrote, that Moses

commanded, the law of Moses, the book of Moses, the law came by Moses, Moses gave you circumcision, Moses gave you the law, the gift that Moses commanded, did so in any other sense than that the Mosaic origin was the accepted view of himself and the age that he addressed. The critical theory puts Christ in the attitude of palming off the shallowest of fictions for veritable history. It charges upon him and the sacred books the grossest fraud, a conception wholly at war with his purity, and the exalted morality conceded by the critics themselves as characterizing the whole Bible. A pretence so great and a moral elevation so marked standing together is impossible in thought. They mutually destroy each other. The theory in its logical and practical outcome breeds distrust in the Word of God. It depreciates or rejects the authority of the Holy Word. It utterly discredits the words of Christ, and rejects the explicit utterances of the apostles from the domain of scientific exegesis. It converts history into the baldest of fictions. It eliminates the supernatural and substitutes unsupported conjectures for the directest and most definite of Biblical statements. By an historical process it relegates alleged revelations to the limbo of idiocy and superstition, and inspiration becomes a thing at which one smiles and shrugs his shoulders.

REVELATION A DEVELOPMENT: ITS TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT PHASES.

B. C. DEWEESE.

In every Christian land this theme receives thoughtful consideration. There can be no question, then, of the propriety of its discussion before this body. The language in which the subject is stated admits of several interpretations. Stress may be laid on Revelation, on Development, on Transient and Permanent Phases, and each of these may be explained in several ways. Moreover, the principles of those who discuss the subject may differ. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find positions advocated which are mutually supplementary, or even antagonistic.

I shall discuss the subject with special reference to the ideas signified by its leading words. The discussion can not be more than suggestive. The following questions sufficiently forecast the line of thought:

I. *What is Revelation?*

II. *How is Revelation a Development?*

III. *What are Transient and Permanent Phases of Revelation?*

I. What is Revelation?

Better results will be secured, I think, by considering the common use of the word before trying to fix its meaning in this discussion. Simply and briefly, a

revelation is a manifestation. A locomotive, a telescope, a watch, are revelations of man's inventive genius and constructive powers. They manifest his capabilities. If we witness the making of a watch, the genius of the inventor discloses itself before our eyes. In the British Museum are statues which reveal the genius of Greek sculptors long since dead. Athens with her temples in ruins still has striking revelations of the skill of her architects. St. Peter's shows the thought of Michael Angelo built in stone. The revelations of man's genius may appear to his contemporaries, or its products may long survive him and manifest it to posterity.

Revelation in its religious sense is the manifestation of God for man's redemption. Important distinctions demand attention. God reveals or manifests himself by his acts and by his words. The revelation through nature, used in the broad sense which includes man's rational and moral attributes, is particularly a manifestation through acts; the Bible, as we shall see, is a record of God's second manifestation of himself. These are the earlier and later volumes of God's revelation. Revelation may be objectively complete, but man may imperfectly comprehend it. In the Kosmos are manifold manifestations of God's power, of his wisdom, and of his benevolent interest in the welfare of his creatures. But these lessons may not be read by the observer. He may see little evidence that God acts in nature. The objective revelation is a fixed quantity, but the subjective revelation, the human apprehension of God's ways, varies indefinitely. It is important that this distinction be kept in mind. Thousands view the Sistine Madonna of Raphael who

see no manifestation of the artist's genius. A few visit it to whom every square inch of the painting is a study of hours. The genius is there, though few visitors have eyes to see it. God so impressed himself on nature that the Psalmist could sing, "The heavens declare the glory of God; the firmament showeth his handiwork." He says these lessons extend "to the end of the world." Alas! they fall on ears dull of hearing. Man is too blind to see in nature this manifestation of God. It is so plainly written, however, that idolatry and moral degradation are without excuse. Though knowing God through the things that are made, knowing his eternal power and divinity, man refused to retain God in his knowledge and failed to glorify him as God; therefore, his reasonings became vain and his heart was darkened. Sin so blinded man's eyes that the manifestation of God in nature ceased to have much helpful significance.

In view of this God manifested himself anew to man. He issued a second volume. This manifestation contains a republication of those truths about God's power and moral government which he impressed on nature. The earlier manifestation was clearly seen by those who had eyes to see. The second contains an interpretation of what the heavens declare. Besides this, it adds to our knowledge of God. It discloses God's activity in word and work in a new sphere. Here God is addressing himself specially to the religious nature of man, who has become aware of his helplessness in the conflict with sin. For good reasons the second manifestation is fully described in a verbal record. It was by a natural process that the record of God's revelation came to be called a reve-

lation. The general purpose of both manifestations was that man should seek God.

We meet here the demand for information respecting this later self-disclosure of God. Where shall we find this revelation? Theories about it are numerous. Some of them shall now receive attention. Literati, whose thought is slightly tinged with religious emotion, tell us we shall find it in the exalted utterances of a Shakespeare or a Goethe. Their words do manifest their marvelous genius, but they are not a manifestation of God in any sense that justifies us in calling them a revelation. This view mistakes the impulse of genius for the voice of God. Their words do not save souls. It is the peculiar function of the later revelation to manifest God in saving relations with man. It brings him within the field of human vision; it shows God to us as the Savior of man. If the teachings of Schiller or of Milton differ from those of Paul or John in degree only, as these theorists claim, the world has no authoritative, objective standard by which to regulate its religious thought and life. This is patent to all who think soundly. If we must search the writings of genius to find God's verbal revelation, how shall we know a truth directly manifested by God? By what sign shall this truth be distinguished from truth discovered without divine help? The literature of man will refine human nature, but it does not bring salvation. This view leaves us hopelessly involved. Here no hand points surely heavenward.

Some modern writers allege that the "Sacred Books" of the world furnish what we seek. These books are the products of the religious activity of

man. When he reached a certain stage of his development religious ideas spontaneously appeared. The Sacred Book is the aggregate of the religious thought of the people among whom it originated. The superior claim of the Bible they concede. It has this superiority because it is the product of a highly gifted people, under the environment most favorable to the production of religious ideas. Such is the theory. A full discussion of its merits would require an extended treatment of Comparative Religion. Here and now this is not needed. Between the Bible and other sacred books there is practically no rivalry, except among those nations whose religious thought has taken this literary form.

In the second century Montanus and two female companions taught that God's verbal communications were continuous. They held that the Bible period was not at the close, but at some middle stage of God's manifestation of himself by verbal communications. The claim has no solid basis. The following from "Progressive Orthodoxy" states the conclusion generally reached: "The greatest thinkers of the Church have found themselves in all their thinking in closest sympathy with and dependence upon the Apostolic teaching. They have been able to carry out its conceptions of Christ into fuller form and more intricate connections; they have never been able to correct one of these conceptions, nor to place another beside them in the inner circle of revelation. It is the fulfillment of Christ's promise to lead his apostles into the whole truth." A more recent writer says: "The progress of the Church, whatever it be, requires the appreciation of the truths of reve-

lation already given, in new relations and environment, and not the revelation of new truth." "The word as given requires application; heralds to declare it, and not more prophets to add to it."

The scope of our investigation now lies within narrower limits. There remains an examination of God's manifestation of himself in the Bible era. Respecting the manifestation itself and the channel through which it reaches us, two views are held. Romanism asserts that Protestants reject large and important portions when they confine themselves to the biblical writings. Both agree that revelation ceased with the apostolic age, but the Romanist holds that it comes to us through two parallel lines, the Bible and extra-biblical tradition. These, in his view, supplement each other. I quote from Philip Schaff on the position of Rome: "It has always been held that the Pope and the bishops are not the creators and judges, but the trustees and witnesses of the Apostolic deposit of faith, and that they can define and proclaim no dogma which is not well founded in the primitive tradition, written or unwritten." Protestants hold that all extant verbal revelation is found within the Bible. At first all apostolic teaching was oral. The writings followed, but were a reproduction in substance of the oral teaching. The first hearers received their knowledge from the lips of the preacher. The few among them who had access to apostolic writings had truth in two-fold form. They could appeal to their recollection of the oral proclamation, or they could find its substance in the writings. This paper proposes no discussion of the antagonism between Rome and Protestantism. I shall briefly summarize the two views and then discuss

the Protestant position. Rome advocates an infallible interpretation by an infallible church of an infallible revelation—that is, the Bible and other authenticated tradition. Protestantism holds that the Bible is the sole, infallible rule of faith and life, and that private judgment is responsible for its right application.

The position of Protestantism is interpreted in two ways. Their discussion furnishes the last limitation which a merely suggestive discussion of our topic seems to admit. That the Bible contains the Word of God and the Bible is the Word of God, are affirmations which express the two views, as usually stated. The first implies that the entire Bible is not to be looked upon as a product of divine energy through human agency. The Word of God is the precious metal, but it must be separated from the human elements with which it is intermingled. By human elements I mean those which find place in the Bible by human authority. No reference is made, of course, to the human dress of the divine elements—the human language, which is the vehicle of the divine message. Prof. Ladd, a strong advocate, speaks of "the distinction between the Bible and the Word of God," and censures "that fundamental misconception which identifies the Bible and the Word of God." He further says, "It is far more dangerous not to make the distinction between the Bible and the Word of God than to make it." How can we make the distinction? The Professor replies: "The illumined conscience and reason of the body of believers discerns, appropriates and applies the Word of God." "The Christian consciousness, the consciousness of the church, discerns the Word of God." "The com-

munity of believers is the ultimate authority, its moral and religious consciousness the last appeal." How is this body qualified for its delicate and important task? "The very existence as well as the exercise of the moral and religious consciousness implies the work of the Holy Spirit within the believing soul." "Our doctrine is the doctrine of the testimony of the Holy Spirit." According to this, the Holy Spirit not only effects the regeneration of the soul and testifies to its work, but it also qualifies the body of believers to go through the Bible and separate its elements, assigning to God the things that came directly from God, and to man the things which he discovered for himself. Ladd's ponderous volumes which discuss this question, exhibit, I think, confusion of thought and a failure to go to the real merits of the question. He betrays too much feeling in his opposition to the strictly mechanical, post-reformation dogma of inspiration. He repudiates, again and again, the idea that men were inspired to write biblical records, though one can not easily see that this cuts any important figure in the case. Its shadow so haunts him that he trips in the argument. We need some clear thinking along this line just now. Religious demagogism displays its faulty argument and ugly spirit on both sides of the question. Both parties are greatly wanting in that calm, judicial spirit which is the *sine qua non* of sound conclusions. On one side we see a strong tendency to intrude a rationalistic spirit into the conception of the Scriptures and of inspiration. Authority is scouted. Some go so far as to assert that their opinion of what God ought to say is the measure of what he has said. Beware lest we go too far on this

a priori road. On the other hand, we are asked to subscribe to some human theories about the Bible and inspiration—theories which we can not reject, we are told, without giving up our Bible to unbelief. All theories about the Bible and inspiration are human, and must not be forced upon the church till the final verdict of thorough, consecrated scholarship has been rendered. If judicious study has more light to shed on this problem, we should suspend judgment till all available information has been gathered. The danger lies now in the direction of the first extreme. Let us guard this point well. If you will pardon further digression, I commend to you these wise words of Flint on the relations of conservatism and progress, the appreciation of which is an imperative duty: "The one does not necessarily confine or restrict the activity of the other. They are so far from being essentially antagonistic, that they may co-operate—may support and help each other; nay, they must do so, if religious development is to be natural, easy, peaceful, and regular. This is but saying, in another form, that religious development, when true and normal, must combine and harmonize conservatism and progress. All development must do that, or it will be of an imperfect and injurious kind." With this healthful protest against extreme views on either side, let us return to the discussion of the issue raised by Prof. Ladd's school.

In their view the Bible is a broader term than the Word of God. The Bible contains the latter, but it contains something more. "The Bible, as we have it," writes Prof. Ladd, "is not the perfect and infallible divine word without admixture of faulty and tem-

porary elements." "By the Word of God must here be understood all those truths and facts of morals and religion which, when taken in their organic unity and regarded in their historical relations, give us the true history and essential ideas and principles of the divine self-revelation of redemption." The canonical Scriptures embrace "the Word of God which is *Christocentric.*" It is very difficult to find anything in the writings of this school which will enable us to fix definitely the extent and contents of the "Word of God." They mean, if I understand them, to call those portions of the Bible which furnish more particularly a basis for our faith in Christ, and which are authoritative in matters of duty, the Word of God. To this serious objections present themselves. Those portions of the Bible by which God prepared man for the coming of Christ are just as much his word as the later lessons are. Their authority for those to whom they came was just as binding as the more complete teaching is upon us. It was just as necessary that Israel should obey him who spoke on earth as it is that we should obey the Lord from heaven. The authority of any word of God for those to whom it was spoken, is equal, and does not depend at all on the fact whether it is milk for babes or meat for the mature. Prof. Ladd utterly mistakes the doctrine of those who taught extreme views of mechanical inspiration, when he supposes that view carried the implication that because we have in the Pentateuch an infallible account of the divine legation of Moses, we must therefore lead lambs to the altar. It is one thing to hold that the Bible is throughout an infallible record; it is quite another to hold that all the laws and ceremonies

of the Old Testament are binding upon us as duties. No respectable believer in the post-reformation theory of infallible dictation ever held that they were. Further, if God is responsible for the Bible, it is in a noble sense the Word of God throughout. It is a most arbitrary and harmful limitation to use the term, "Word of God," for those portions of the Bible which specially reveal God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself and which enjoin our duties. Such limitations lead to wrong views of the character and authority of the Bible. The word spoken by angels was just as divine as the Sermon on the Mount, and this is not denying that the latter manifests a higher type of thought and duty. We who have heard all our lives sermons on rightly dividing the Word should appreciate this position. The failure to discriminate between dispensations is fruitful of error. If men could see that the Bible has its dispensations, each with its laws binding those who lived under it, all adapted to man's progress under the guiding care of God, we should soon drop the use of language which misleads men and does dishonor to the Bible.

The theory that the Christian consciousness is inspired to discern the word of God in the Bible is little better than the Romish doctrine of the infallibility of Pope and General Councils. It is, in fact, but a modification of that doctrine under a new name. Rome can, with equal right, lay claim to this inspiration. She teaches things necessary to be believed on pain of damnation, which Protestantism with one voice rejects. Protestantism is divided, and we dare not deny it, on matters of faith and duty. The Unitarian pleads Christian consciousness for his denial of the

divinity of our Lord. The Friends, on the same grounds, reject baptism and the Lord's Supper. The position that the Christian consciousness is inspired to bring us all to speak the same thing respecting faith and duty, is as purely a figment of the imagination as is the "*Consensus Patrum*" of Rome. Through inspiration the Holy writings completely furnish man for every good work, but God does not propose to interpret them for us. Patient thinking will reveal the weakness of this theory of the divine guidance in discerning and appropriating "the word of God contained in the Bible." The theory creates more difficulties than it removes. We have God's word in human language. It is ours to preserve that word in its integrity, to translate it correctly, and to interpret it faithfully. Emphasizing infinitesimal blemishes in translation, variations in manuscripts, and discrepancies of numbers, etc., when all competent authorities tell us that in no case do they affect any article of faith or obscure any duty, is idle. Prof. Ladd indulges this refinement of criticism, I am sorry to say. He reminds one of Huxley's mistake in supposing that he decides the case against miracles when he discusses the cursing of the fig tree, and the entering of the demons into the swine. It is not the purpose of this paper to discuss the Pentateuchal analysis by higher criticism, or the canonicity of this or that book. Taking the Bible as we have it, may we justify our faith that it manifests God?

The Bible is what it is, with its history, its human sayings, its prophetic visions, its law, its poetry, its biographies, because God made it so. Here we must face alleged difficulties about inspiration. In the

Bible are long speeches filled with bad advice and unsound argument, historical narratives, and some words from the devil himself. Are all these elements inspired? Let us not confuse our minds by false issues. Because these things find place in the Bible, nobody claims that bad arguments, or the devil's views, must be adopted. Inspiration is responsible for a correct report of what man thought and said, and of Satan's efforts to ruin him; but it does not stand responsible for the soundness of the reasoning of Job's friends, for example. The Bible records these things to show us that in manifesting himself as man's Redeemer, God understood the case—that he met the real issues before man. We could not see the full significance of God's speech in the closing chapters of Job, were it not that we have such fine groundwork in the speeches that precede it. It corrects their faulty teaching, and shows the way out of darkness. Let us clarify our thinking on this subject. An objector says inspiration is not needed to write history. The logical infirmities of this objection ought to be manifest to sober thought. Inspiration is not required to write ordinary history, but without divine help, who was able to select from the history of the race, and specially of Israel, those incidents which so aptly illustrate the process of God's manifestation of himself in preparing the world for that far-off coming of the Son of Man? Prof. Ladd's words can be quoted on this point with full approval: "God revealed himself *in* the history; he made men know him as their Redeemer by what he actually brought to pass in history." "The record becomes something more than a mere record of the history of revelation;

it becomes itself a revelation—a making of God known to others." "The history of the process" by which God makes himself known as the Redeemer of the world from sin "is in large measure given in the Bible, not only in the form of historical facts that were ascertained in the ordinary way of becoming acquainted with such facts, but also as having a divine significance which was *revealed*, or made known by inspiration to the writers themselves."

The human writers of the Bible builded more wisely than they knew. They worked without knowing how the Divine Builder was shaping their productions so that each fell into its proper place with special reference to that far-off manifestation of God through Christ. The Bible is an effect, an organism, which exhibits a wisdom wiser than man. It is the product of a far-seeing Author who kept the end in view at every step. He could use documents already in existence, those in process of formation, reveal truth directly—in short, God could and did gather material for the world's Bible from many quarters. It is an intellectual impossibility for writers far apart in place and time, and ignorant of the end in view, to write as Bible writers wrote. To compose a narrative, or compile one from existing documents, which would fit into the marvelous structure of the Bible, when the writer could not possibly have any conception of the completed design, required a degree of inspiration little short of that which foretold the Messiah's coming. If we understand the question in its wider bearings, we shall have no trouble in showing why men were inspired to write Bible history.

We hear it said that inspiration qualified men to

speak, but not to write. Prof. Ladd resorts to italics to emphasize this. Let an anonymous writer dispose of this objection: "There is not a scintilla of evidence that God assumed to the minds of the apostles a new relation as they sat down to write, and that, in consequence, what they wrote had a different quality from what they said. It is absurd to suppose that Paul expected his readers to find in the written inculcation of the doctrine a divineness which they had not perceived in the oral presentation of it." Both stood on an equal footing with writers and readers. The latter never disputed the authority of a written communication from inspired men. Paul expected obedience to the message without regard to the manner of its communication. "Hold the traditions which ye were taught, whether by word or by epistle of ours." "The things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." God's teachers had a message from God to man.

Do we not lay too much stress on the necessity for perfectly understanding inspiration? I accept it as a fact, but what theory of inspiration fully accounts for all the phenomena of the Bible? Partly because man is not able to understand the ways of God, partly because it has not been disclosed, and partly because we have not made wisest use of material available, have we failed to attain to full knowledge of this great theme. We accept the Incarnation. Who lays claim to full understanding of it? Does not this hold of inspiration? For the simplest, clearest, and most comprehensive statement of God's relation to the Bible known to me, I am indebted to Dr. S. S. Laws. It is this: *God Assumes the Responsibility for the Author-*

ship of the Bible. The writers were moved to their work by the Holy Spirit. They received all the aid they needed, but no more. They were seldom conscious of all that the Spirit which was in them did signify. The very word inspiration implies the presence of an energy not native to man. It is something breathed into him. By his own power God wrought upon the human spirit till it attained such harmony with God's spirit that man could speak for God. There is a co-operation. Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. In the words of Prof. Manly, "The word is not *of* man, as to its source; nor depending *on* man, as to its authority. It is *by* and *through* man as its medium . . . as the agent voluntarily active and intelligent in its communication. The men spoke; the impulse and direction were from God." The additions made from time to time were objective and divine. New manifestations of truth came from God in divers portions and in divers manners. No one could see far enough into the purpose of the ages to speak for God, unless the Spirit of God was upon him. Newman Smyth pertinently says, "Like nature itself amid its diversities, the Bible is one continuous whole and one grand design. But that design was not in the minds of the successive workmen. They knew not the perfect whole into which their lives and work, as we now can see, are fitted. Prophets and apostles, called by the Lord to speak to their own age, little knew what a Bible they were making for mankind. That work was beyond their ken; that design was larger than the knowledge of the very men who were providentially called to execute it. Our Bible in its completeness

and its unity might be a vast surprise to Moses or Isaiah; and Paul, and the last of the disciples, St. John, could hardly have stood far enough away from their own work to see how perfectly it completed the whole."

To sum up, the Bible shows us how God manifested himself to man for man's salvation. God gave him truth which he could not learn without divine help; he taught man the significance of material already in hand—fashioning out of these elements the Bible—Book of books, our comfort in distress, our guide where we were ignorant, our stay in weakness, our instruction in the highest truth, the witness for God, pointing us ever on to the soul's eternal home.

II. How is Revelation a Development?

The answer will depend chiefly on how the word development is understood. Men talk of the development of stars and of planets, of plants and animals, of individuals and kinds, of the resources of a country, its agriculture, its commerce, its schools, its cities, its railroads. This shows that the word is either very comprehensive, or that it is used with but little precision. Development is not a simple, but a wonderfully complex process. We all believe we developed from babyhood to childhood; we know we developed from childhood to youth, and from youth to manhood. We know that the plant comes from the seed, the chick from the egg. About us everywhere are evidences of development. This we see, though we may not accept the hypotheses of extreme evolutionists who teach that stars come from star m from the monad. We have learned

ganisms, plant and animal, develop from the germ, and always at the expense of their environment. Mind develops, but not at the expense of its environment, showing therein a different origin and nature. All this leads us to expect development in revelation. Our Lord said, "The kingdom of heaven is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: which indeed is less than all seeds, but when it is grown, it is greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof." Here is development in spiritual things, and on lines analogous to those familiar to us in nature's processes. The kingdom grows, "first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear." So with wider view we are justified in affirming that revelation develops. Facts we must accept. Some theories about facts, false facts and mere guesses we are now urged to accept on the alleged guaranty of science. The man who is afraid of science does not believe in God, but the man who accepts all the statements of scientific men about the development of religion has more credulity than the devotees of Rome have.

Revelation is not a development whose origin is found in the spontaneous generation of a few religious ideas by gifted men in early ages,—ideas which grew under favorable environment till we have the completed product, the Bible. Nor did God give man a few ideas, which he was left to develop through his own religious activity. The Bible is not a record of what man could produce with a few ideas from God to start with; it is a development, grand, many-sided, of splendid, symmetrical proportions, moving ever on

toward the fullest display of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. I am certain that Paul was conscious of this when he teaches that God's wisdom is manifested through the church "*according to the purpose of the ages.*" From end to end, the race history, the national history, the family history, the personal incident, the law, the poetry, the prophecy, took their place in shaping the whole movement toward that future divine manifestation to which the whole revelation moved. No one can understand the Bible who fails to see this majestic onward sweep. No one who understands this can fail to see that a divine supervision was exercised throughout. Here will be found the best of all reasons for the inspiration of the Bible.

Development in revelation can be illustrated in many ways. God discloses his own nature to his creatures in larger and larger measure. He is the Creator founding the heavens and the earth. Then we see him coming into personal relations with man. Man finds this delightful and helpful, for his God is a covenant-keeping God. In the process of time the divine compassion and mercy stand out more and more clearly until we find that the God over all is our Father in Heaven. From the sacrifice of Abel to the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, slain from the foundation of the world, we find development. There is larger apprehension of the strength of sin, of the guilt and consequences of sin, a growing conviction that the blood of animal sacrifices could not purge the conscience, till we reach the position where sins are remembered no more and where there is no more conscience of them. Every minor lesson of development sheds its light upon the great purpose of God, the

purpose of the ages, to manifest God as the Redeemer from sin. Coeval with the fall of man began the unfolding of God's purpose to rescue him. Dimly seen at first, more distinctly proclaimed to the father of the faithful, opening wider its secrets through the institutions of Mosaism, flashing more and more light on man's darkened path through the evangelical prophecies of Isaiah and other seers, bursting forth into dawn at the Baptist's trumpet-call to Israel to make ready for the coming King, it reached its noonday splendor through the personal ministry of the Lord and the Twelve. How marvelous its manifestations of the divine love! How it reveals the glorious destiny of the redeemed! Man's longings for eternal life were imperfectly disclosed under the first covenant. In the New Testament era he is a seeker for eternal life, and the idea is fully developed. We enter into fellowship with the Father and with the Son, which is life eternal. The revelations through the Incarnation are boundless. Its law of blessing is grace for grace—a never-failing stream of divine mercies. The preparation of the world for the coming of the Son of Man, the revelation of the Father through him, the bringing of many sons to glory—this is the Bible development. It exhibits wonderfully God's power, his wisdom, and his love. Everything contributes to this. Jesus Christ stands before the Bible student as the Sun of Righteousness, the center of the spiritual system which the Bible reveals. Everywhere we see progress—movement from elementary to more mature thought. It is all essential. It is all truth of God. Nothing is to be rejected, but everywhere there is adaptation to the progress man

makes—milk for babes and strong meat for those who have their senses exercised by reason of use. The writers had visions of God. Some stood above their fellows and had wider view of the height and depth and length and breadth of the love of God. At all times the disclosing of God's purpose is correlated to man's progress in apprehending it. Slowly, very slowly at times, did the work go on. The Incarnation would have been insoluble to Adam, to Noah, to Abraham, to Moses, to David. It took the world ages to learn that it was "without strength." God alone knew when it was "due time" for Christ to die for the ungodly. God patiently taught man. Line upon line, precept upon precept, was the method. As a mighty river flows to the north, to the south, to the east, to the west, yet ever on to the sea, so the race, under God's guiding hand, notwithstanding its waywardness, its evil heart of unbelief, its falling away from God, was brought in God's good time to hear the Son and live. This development had its epochs. At strategic places and at opportune times, God made large disclosures of his will Time was then given men to apprehend the manifestation. To those who had more was given.

Around chosen spirits, in the very nick of time, the miracles are grouped. They are not scattered everywhere in Israel's history, without purpose, at places or times of little significance, existing even in the mere fancy of a credulous, sign-seeking people, as our arrogant sciolists of the Mrs. Ward type falsely proclaim. On the contrary, when God selected his messenger through whom he designed to make large additions to his self-manifestation, he bore him witness with mira-

cles. When we find miracles grouped in the Bible, we find also large additions to our knowledge of God. They accompany large self-revelation of God to man. The two go hand in hand. Vain will be our effort to successfully commend the Bible to men of our time by some process that makes truth effective through its moral evidences alone. I know how reluctant our age is to admit the miraculous. The temptation is great to seek some way to commend the revelation, minus the miracles. How disloyal we can unconsciously become! What could we do and what would we be without the Incarnation and the Resurrection? We need not waste our time in trying to apologize to our over-wise and law-dazed scientists for the Bible miracles. Let us master their strange and intimate relations to other parts of God's self-manifestation, and then courteously and fearlessly proclaim the miraculously witnessed truth to all men. Whenever we become too tenderfooted for the miracles we are in danger of committing logical suicide. God commands you and me to proclaim his Works and his Word, but he asks no apology from us for either. Our wise men after the flesh are not one whit wiser in their generation than were those whom Paul met. He asked, "Why is it judged incredible with you, if God doth raise the dead?" Paul knew how to meet unbelief. He proclaimed the resurrection to a materialistic and philosophical skepticism. He did not confine himself to the moral evidences because his hearers doubted the miracles. The history of the Church shows that every effort to limit the amount of truth preached by the prejudices of those who hear, ends in failure. Further, we learn from the same source that when

God's heralds faithfully proclaimed the truth in its integrity, the power of God was present to heal the people. We are responsible for faithful preaching; God will look after results. Think on these things.

In conclusion and briefly, as time presses, let us dispose of the third question.

III. What are Transient and Permanent Phases of Revelation?

The word transient, I think, is out of place here. Revelation can not be transient. There were transient ordinances and elementary instruction, but no transient revelation. Everything revealed remains forever a part of the knowledge imparted from on high, and will forever continue to produce its intended effects. Under the first covenant were "carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation." The law led men to Christ. When he came we were no longer under the law. We go to Christ, not to Moses, for ordinances; but we go to both for God's revelation. We do not make the law of none effect through the faith in Christ. The Old Testament is filled with lessons put there by God for us. Paul says, "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." God's purpose in putting them there was to instruct us. We sometimes hear that we have passed beyond the time when man needs some things in either Testament. Of this no man is judge. No one knows through what devious ways portions of our race may be obliged to learn its way to the Light of the world. Besides this, it is a narrow view that rejects parts of the Bible because they may not be needed again for practice. They are invaluable as a

commentary on God's gradual self-manifestation to man; in fact, they are part of it. Every age, every people needs truth adapted to its wants. Things which we have outgrown may be indispensable to inferior races in their coming to God. The Bible has truth which we are yet unprepared for. It finds place there against the time to come. Who shall say that God may not somewhere and somehow find use again and again for all that is in the Bible? Our duty lies in accepting that word in its integrity. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God." "Add then not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar." Whatever else may fail, we shall always need the Bible to instruct us on the character of God, the character of man, the relations of God and man, the Incarnation, the Reconciliation, and the revelations respecting man's destiny. If we are loyal to God, he will verify over and over again these closing words: "For as the rain cometh down and the snow from heaven and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth and maketh it bring forth and bud, and giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater; so shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it. For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall

be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off."

REVELATION A DEVELOPMENT: ITS TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT PHASES.

J. C. REYNOLDS.

Revelation is a word of Latin origin. The Latin word *velum* means "a veil, curtain, or hanging." Hence the verb *velo*, and in the infinitive mood, *velare*, "to cover, to veil, to hide." Then with the prefix *re*, with the sense of "again or back," we have the Latin verb *revelare*, to turn back the curtain, to uncover. Hence the Latin noun *revelatio*, to which add the letter n, and we have our English noun, revelation. Literally, it is the name of the act of lifting the veil, the act of uncovering. "To *reveal* is literally *to lift the veil*, and thus make known what was previously concealed," says Webster.

In the New Testament Greek the verb *kalupto*, means "to cover, veil, hide, conceal." It occurs seven times, and is rendered *cover* five times and *hide* twice. But prefixing *apo*, we have the verb *apokalupto*, meaning "to uncover, reveal, disclose." It occurs twenty-six times and is rendered *reveal* every time. The noun *apokalupsis*, having the same root as the verb, means "a revelation, disclosure, manifestation; *literally*, an uncovering." These words in the Greek language mean exactly the same as the Latin originals of our words reveal and revelation.

Now hear Webster's definition of revelation in its common English usage:

"1. The act of revealing, or disclosing, or discovering to others what was before unknown to them.

"2. That which is revealed.

"3. (Theol.) (*a*) The act of revealing divine truth. (*b*) That which is revealed by God to man."

Three things are essential to the act of revealing. 1. A revealer. 2. A message or knowledge to communicate. 3. An intelligence capable of understanding the thing revealed. Without these the act of revealing is an impossibility. The revealer must be, in knowledge, superior to the one to whom the communication is given. The act of revelation may be performed on a field as large as that occupied by men, angels, and God. But to-day we must confine ourselves to the act of God in imparting truth to humanity, and to the thing imparted in the act. God is a Revealer of truth, and man is the recipient. God communicates truth to men. But *how* does he do it? 1. By speaking words of human language so as to be heard and understood by men. God spoke at the baptism of his Son in Jordan. "And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." "And there came a voice from heaven, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." "In *thee* I am well pleased," as Wescott and Hort give the original. "A voice came from heaven which said, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." Here Matthew, Mark and Luke say that a voice spoke from heaven saying two things, one that Jesus is the Speaker's Son, the other that the Speaker is well pleased in him. Jesus has but one Father, God. Then God and he who on that occasion spoke with a voice are one. "But," says one, "God never speaks

in an audible voice." If so, the voice speaking from heaven at the Savior's baptism was not heard. That which is not audible is not heard. If not heard, how was it known that a voice spoke at all? On the Mount of Transfiguration the same voice used the same words. "Behold, a voice out of the cloud which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him. And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid." Here again the Speaker declares Jesus his Son and adds the command, "Hear ye him;" obey him. This time God did speak in a voice that was audible. Three men, Peter, James and John heard it. Peter, one of the three disciples who witnessed the Transfiguration, says: "This voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." To deny that God ever speaks in an audible voice amounts to a denial of the correctness of the history recorded by Matthew, Mark and Luke, and to a denial of the truthfulness of Peter's statement.

2. God reveals truth to men, speaking by angels. The Angel Gabriel appeared in the temple to Zacharias and told him that he would, though old, and his "wife well stricken in years," have a son, and that he should call his name John. Zacharias asked for proof, and "The angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to shew thee these glad tidings." Afterwards the same angel appeared to Mary in Nazareth, and told her that she was to be the mother of the Son of God. The angel talked in human speech to Mary, and Mary talked to the angel. An angel first announced the birth of Mary's Son and God's Son to

the shepherds. Then, "Suddenly a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, good will toward men." Thus in human ears angel voices sounded the gladdest news that had ever yet sent a thrill of joy through a human heart and sung the praises of the Most High on the plains of Bethlehem. An angel was the first to salute human ears and gladden human hearts with the words, "He is not here: for he is risen, as he said." Happy, honored angels! First to tell of the Savior's birth! First to tell of his resurrection!

3. God speaks to men by men. Peter makes a good statement of the method: "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost;" or, as the Revised Version has it, "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." This is a good rendering if the word Spirit were substituted for the word Ghost. Following the text of Wescott and Hort, and strictly observing the syntax of the passage, a perspicuous translation would read: *Men, led by the Holy Spirit, spoke from God.* So when God speaks by men he leads them by the Holy Spirit to give utterance to the facts, truth, precepts, promises and threatenings which he wishes to communicate to humanity.

Webster's second definition of revelation is: "That which is revealed." This in its breadest sense would include all knowledge that God has made accessible to us. But we have to confine ourselves chiefly to the body of truth that he has revealed to us in the Bible. Whenever we have a pure text of the originals of this Book, and an exactly correct translation of these texts into the languages of our times, we shall have a perfect presentation of God's truth to the human under-

standing. While we do not have that, we do have texts so nearly pure, and translations so nearly correct, that the common people may hear, understand, obey and be saved.

Is this revelation a development? To this question we must now address ourselves. The word development is defined by Webster very much like revelation. Its first meaning as a verb is: "To free from a cover or envelope, to disclose or make known, to unfold gradually, as a flower from a bud; hence, to bring through a succession of states or stages, each of which is preparatory to the next; to lay open by degrees, to unravel, as, to develop a plot."

From all eternity to all eternity God is, exists, lives. But without a revelation the fact is covered with the veil of ignorance, and thus concealed from the eyes of the understanding of men. From all eternity to all eternity he is possessed of the attributes of infinite justice, mercy, knowledge and power, and is Love; but the veil covered all this truth, and men without a revelation from him grope their way in darkness. To strip off this veil and expose, to the eyes of human understanding, God in his attributes exactly meets the first part of the definition of development, but it just as exactly fills the literal meaning of the word revelation. So, thus far, a development is a revelation and a revelation is a development.

Wherein, then, do the two words differ? Simply and only in this: That development is the method of God in making a full revelation of himself. If God had given all the truth there is in the Bible in a single communication, and by only one revealing act, then

there would have been no development in the revealing act.

But God did not so reveal himself to us. Hear the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers, hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son." Common Version. "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in *his* Son." Revised Version. In one particular the Revised Version of this passage is an improvement on the Common. The word *polumeroos*, the first word in the epistle, rendered in the Common Version "At sundry times," is, in the Revised Version, much more correctly rendered "By divers portions." The word, *polumeroos*, is an adverb and also a compound word made up of two words, *polu*, many, and *meroos*, a part. The adverb thus formed is accurately translated into English by the prepositional phrase, "in many parts." The adverb *polutropoos*, rendered in the Common Version "In divers manners," and the same in the Revised, is also a compound word made up of the same prefix *polu*, many, and *trepos*, "a turn, mode, manner, way." The passage literally and syntactically translated into plain English would read: God, who, in time past, spoke in the prophets, to the fathers in many parts and in many ways, has, at the last of these days, spoken to us in *his* Son.

What are the many ways or methods by which God has spoken? At the expense of a little repetition the answer is: By words spoken by his own voice, by words spoken by angels, by words spoken by men, the

prophets, and by women the prophetesses, and once "the Lord opened the mouth" of a mere beast of burden and caused her to rebuke "the madness of the prophet." God also has revealed himself in types and symbols and ordinances and deliverances. But grandest of all, culmination of all, he has spoken to us in his Son. He has spoken in the words of Jesus, in his successful resistance of all temptation, in his miracles, in his tears, in his death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and in his glorification.

But what are the many parts in which God has spoken to us? In answer to this question we shall find revelation a development. Among the earliest things God said to man, he formulated a prohibitory law with its penalty annexed: "But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." In this law God is revealed as a God of justice. He will execute the law, inflict the penalty upon the offender to the letter. In consequence of the violation of this law death is the inevitable lot of every one of the race of man. God's stern justice is fully vindicated in the death of all men. God laid the foundation of his divine government in an administration of stern justice. The angels that sinned were cast out and down to *tartarus* without any hope of mercy. They are already in chains of darkness awaiting the final infliction of the stern justice of an offended God in the execution of the eternal penalties due their sins against the divine law. Angels have always lived under the administration of justice. They only know God as the God of justice, uprightness, majesty and power. To them and to man in his first estate he only

revealed himself in part. Angelic eyes probably looked with admiration and delight at the physical universe spread out in sublime grandeur before them. They doubtless admired, reverenced and adored the Creator for his matchless skill and illimitable power and wisdom displayed in calling into existence a countless number of worlds and systems of worlds, and putting all in motion, and yet no collisions, no confusion, not even the slightest friction. But they saw everything under the control of law from which there could be no departure without destruction. When they directed their attention to the moral, spiritual government exercised over themselves, they saw law reigning with equal sternness. The angel that sinned they saw cast forever out. They could know God as omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent. They doubtless took delight in honoring and reverencing him for his power, wisdom, truthfulness and justice. But it was not yet for them nor for man in his first estate to worship him as the God of tender, loving mercy. As such he was not yet revealed.

Man, the masterpiece of God's creation so far as this world is concerned, led by Satan's cunning craft, fell into sin. Satan, knowing no remedy for sin, probably thought that by causing man to sin, thus taking him captive he could wrest him and the world that he controlled out of the hands of God, and by conquest, establish for himself a perpetual kingdom on earth. But God was equal to the emergency. There is a development in the revelation of himself to his creatures. He begins to reveal himself as a Redeemer, as a Savior, as a God with an attribute of infinite mercy. The good angels with ecstatic joy

hailed the dawn of the new manifestation of their God in love and mercy, while Satan and all his hosts must have felt keenly disappointed and chagrined as they saw in the unfolding of the, to them, new attribute of tender, loving forgiveness.

When there was no sinner there was no field for the display of God's mercy and no object upon whom to bestow it. When Satan became a sinner there was no tempter to seduce him. He sinned willfully and without excuse. God's mercy was not drawn out towards him. To exercise mercy towards him would be to subordinate justice. Hence, mercy remained unseen and unknown. But when man became a sinner, his act was not willful. He *was tempted*, influenced, deceived by another, led into the wrong and involved in ruin. God's pity is drawn out towards him. God loves him notwithstanding the fall. A Mediator to stand between God and men is sought and found in the Man Christ Jesus. Indissolubly linked to God his Father by the bond of a common divine nature—indissolubly linked to humanity by the bond of a common human nature, Jesus in himself binds humanity and divinity, man and God, as compactly together as if sin and death had never intervened. But in him humanity was sinless even while in the flesh. Humanity in its primitive state was sinless. In its fallen state it is sinful, full of sin. In Christ provision is abundantly made to take away, to blot out, the sins of every man who believes in and obeys him, so that every such one in Jesus may be a partaker of the divine nature.

This glorious plan of salvation in its revelation is a development. For thousands of years it was a matter

of promise—the promises dim at first but growing brighter as each new promise was given. Much that was promise is now fact, now possession, now enjoyment. But there is much, very much, that is promise yet. Hope reaches to that within the veil. Grand, glorious promises are to be realized in eternity. For thousands of years Jesus was typified by the sacrifice of lambs, kids and bullocks, as our sacrifice for our sins, by Moses as mediator and teacher, by Aaron as our high priest, by David as our king. The prophets, likewise, who never saw each other, who lived in different ages, uttered their predictions concerning him; one, one thing; another, another thing. But when Christ came he was all that was foreshadowed by all the victims slain at patriarchal and Jewish altars. He was all that was typified by the royalty of David, by the priesthood of Aaron, and by the mediatorship of Moses. He was the fulfillment of all that the prophets had uttered concerning him. He is the one personage towards whom all ordinances of the Old Dispensations, both patriarchal and Jewish, point. In him was all the good that was reached by the worship of the olden time. The law given by Moses was only a schoolmaster to bring those under its guidance to Christ. Without him it would have been of no value.

But is revelation a development in any other sense? Certainly not in the sense that there is more truth in the word of God now than when the canon of Scripture was closed. The whole Book, as we have seen, contains a full revelation of Jesus the Christ. But no new truth concerning him has been added. But there is a sense in which there has been and will be growth.

One meaning of develop is "to unfold gradually, as a flower from a bud." That is one form of growth. In the parable of the sower, "The word of the kingdom" is the seed and life is in the seed. "The word of the kingdom" is the gospel, and the gospel is Christ crucified, buried, risen. The divine life is in him. "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature." Can Christ expand, unfold, develop in the man, in the new creature? Jesus, when literally in the body, did grow, not in stature only, but also in wisdom. May he not grow spiritually in your heart? To such as are new creatures Peter says, "Desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." It is the duty of all God's children to grow. But his nature is in his children, and the more they grow the stronger they are in their divine nature. A Christian who has grown from a babe in Christ to a full grown man in the Lord has more of the divine in him than when he was a babe. In that sense the divine grows in the man. Such growth, however, is dependent upon the will and conduct of the man. Or, rather, it is subject to the conformity both of the will and the conduct of the man to the will of God.

Paul says, "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might." No one is so strong at birth, in any sense of the word, as in full-grown manhood. So no one has, or can have, so much of the strength of the Lord at his spiritual birth as in his ripe spiritual manhood. So when in obedience to the divine will he feeds upon the divine food and grows, the Lord's strength grows in him. Thus are the divine characteristics gradually unfolded and developed in

us whenever we live in accord with the revealed Word of God.

This development is finely expressed in the parable of the grain of mustard seed. "The seed of the kingdom" is planted in the human heart; it may be the heart of the unlettered rustic, or the heart of a little child; it may be the simplest conception of the child mind, that Jesus, as the Son of God, loved, and still loves little children, and because he loved them gave his life for them. You may present to the rustic or to the little child the most far-reaching truths of the Bible in all their length and breadth, in all their height and depth. But only so much of it as their simple minds comprehend and approve is planted in their hearts. But that grain of mustard seed has a divine germ of life in it. It springs into life. It is sufficient for all the wants of the little soul. It fills it. It satisfies all its longings. But the child grows. Its capacities of understanding are enlarged. Its soul's wants are enlarged too. The grain of mustard seed, its first, its child-conception of the Christ, does not now fill the soul nor satisfy its longings. But it is no longer confined to its first conception. The child having fed upon "the sincere milk of the word," Christ has grown in his heart. His present conception of the Christ as completely fills his enlarged soul and meets its enlarged wants as the child-conception of him filled the child-soul. The child has become a man—a man of learning, a philosopher. But the Christ has grown in him. He now conceives of him as the Maker of all the worlds, as the heir of all things, as the present Conservator of the universe, as the Mediator between God and men, as the Apostle

and High Priest of our profession, as "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords," as the Judge of all, and yet still, the Lover of little children. But the end is not yet. When the soul takes its exit from the mortal body and takes upon it the immortal one, the divine life within still fills it and is sufficient for all its wants. As the life then lived is eternal, will not the growth be also eternal?

This growth idea, as illustrated by the grain of mustard seed, is seen also in the church as the body of Christ. A few unlearned Galilean fishermen began the preaching of the gospel in the proud city, bitterly opposed by the powers of earth and by the powers of Satan's kingdom. Every apostle except one died a martyr's death. Thousands and tens of thousands surrendered their lives for Christ's sake. The emperors thought to crush, to annihilate the church by killing the bodies of the saints. They did not seem to know that it was and is the kingdom of souls. They did not know that killing a thousand citizens of Christ's kingdom did not diminish the number by a single unit. They did not know that the souls were still alive and in the possession and loving care of the Savior. Of all who love him well enough to die for him he has never lost one and never will lose one. The divine Christ is in the church, and its life can never be crushed out. Despite all opposition the kingdom extended from city to city, from province to province. It took root in elite, philosophical Greece, it grew in the martial Roman heart. Within three centuries it covered the whole Roman empire, and the emperor himself surrendered to our King.

Though the church has had to pass through the dark ages of the Roman apostasy, and although the blighting influences of that apostasy are not yet obliterated, the name of Christ is more widely known to-day than ever before. The gospel is being preached more extensively and is taking root in more territory than at any time since the close of the apostolic age. The Bible is being translated into more languages than at any previous time in the church's history. The grand development of the revelation of God in Christ Jesus during the nineteenth century, is: 1. The development, the rapid growth in millions of loving hearts, of the union sentiment, the earnest, honest desire for the union among all the followers of Jesus for which he himself so earnestly prayed just before he died. 2. The rapid development of the missionary spirit, which is the apostolic spirit. Let this good work of the Lord go on! Palsied be the pen that writes against it, and dumb the tongue that calls the people of God away from this good work!

REVELATION A DEVELOPMENT: ITS TRANSIENT AND PERMANENT PHASES.

J. J. HALEY.

Man in his present condition is related to two worlds: the sensuous and the super-sensuous—the sense-world and the spirit-world. The one is a matter of knowledge, the other is a matter of faith. Experience and observation make known to us the first, revelation the second. While man by his physical nature is connected with the earth and the animals that spring from it, his spiritual nature seeks its level in a higher sphere, and draws its inspiration from the Almighty. God's first revelation to man is man. His second is the law. His third is the Gospel. Each supplements and complements the other, but does not contradict it. The method of abrogation is by fulfillment. If man were capable of governing himself, he would need no law; if he perfectly obeyed the law he would need no Gospel. Neither lawn or Gospel, however, was designed to be a revelation, nor even application of universal truth. They unfold the supernatural and define its relation to man, and man's relation to it. The law reveals the moral and regal aspects of the Divine character, the Gospel makes known his Fatherhood. Law is an authoritative expression of will; Gospel is a proclamation of mercy. In the development of a redemptive economy adequate to the wants

of man, it is essential that he should be taught by law to obey God, and by mercy to love him. The Old Testament is, therefore, a book of compulsory precepts and specific directions adapted to the race in its moral childhood. The New, further advanced along the line of the divine education of the race, embodies comprehensive principles of universal application—a law of liberty suitable to the spiritual manhood of the race. The characteristic word of the law was "Thou shalt" and "Thou shalt not," burdening the memory and oppressing the soul with its minuteness and particularity of detail. "Thus saith the Lord," is an Old Testament expression, and partakes of the genius of its institution. The Gospel, dealing but little in specific legislation, and presuming on the higher culture of the moral sense, says in general terms, but with sufficient definiteness: "Whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things." Moses gave the fundamental moral law of the Jewish economy in ten commandments; Christ gave the moral law of the universe in two, and the two contain more than the ten. The one principle of love was substituted for the ten rules of law, and he who possesses the principle fulfills the law without reference to conformity to its outward regulations. The Sermon on the Mount is not so much the enactment of special precepts as the enunciation of principles wondrously searching and comprehensive in their application. "The law came by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ."

In respect to Judaism as a revelation of the Old

Testament, its dominant word, as representative of its religion, was HOLINESS. Among the Greeks the chief word was *wisdom*—an intellectual quality; among the Jews it was *holiness*—a character or moral quality. Rome furnished the body, Greece the head, and Judea the heart of the ancient world, and God chose to reveal himself directly to the *heart*, albeit in the language of the head. Greece taught philosophy, Rome political economy, Judea religion. Each had its own office in the unfolding of the Divine Economy of grace for the salvation of the world. But what idea did the term HOLINESS convey to the enlightened Jewish mind as taught of God? We must not carry into the word all the fullness of meaning when first used that it has to us; but from the earliest time it carried with it *the idea of human character as determined by man's relation to God*. The primary sense of the Hebrew word "holy" is moral purity. It came afterwards to signify, *set apart to God, consecrated, sanctified*. Here, then, in this fine term we have the grand central idea, the regnant thought in the highest Judaism. It is the idea of consecration to Jehovah, and the expression of that consecration by personal purity. It was only the loftiest spirits in the early time that had any adequate appreciation of this thought, and they through the enlightening power of an indwelling divine Spirit. Indeed this is the highest conception that we have yet attained, viz: the obligation of personal purity growing out of a knowledge of our relation to God. The Old Testament idea is the distinct germ and historical parent of this highest Christian conception. To the Jews at the outset the

ideal of character was an ideal of separation from defilement of whatever kind; and the virtue most characteristic of the Jews in every age has been personal purity. This in an ethical sense was their crowning advantage over contemporaneous nations without revelation. Measured by this test, the ancient Jews were much superior to the Greeks even of the time of Socrates. Yet even in this their special moral distinction, judging them by the ideal standard of their own law, they were far below the Christian level. Judaism oppressed women, an invariable feature of a rudimentary age. The law of Moses allowed the husband to divorce the wife on the merest pretense. It tolerated polygamy. Concubinage was placed under restrictions only. It set no stigma on the husband's breach of the marriage vow. Its methods of exposing criminality in the weaker sex was, to say the least, barbarously severe, while the "lords of creation," for the same offense, were allowed without rebuke to go scot free. Moreover, the idea of purity in the earlier time confounded essentials and non-essentials. One can not read without some degree of astonishment the prohibitions that are indiscriminately mingled of the grossest sensual crimes and offenses that have in them no element of moral evil whatsoever. The yoking of an ox and an ass together, and the mixing of linen and woolen in the same garment are forbidden on the same page and in the same terms as the worst offense against morality. The distinction between moral and ceremonial law, and the classification of offenses accordingly, is the product of a later age and a higher religion. This confusion necessarily marks an earlier

time. The sentiment of purity was strong, but rude because untrained, although the training, the educating process, was going on. It became more intelligent even in the earlier periods of their national existence. If the Old Testament be regarded as a perfect revelation of God and human character, then the polygamous Turk, the many-wifed Mormon, and the advocates of Militarism and human slavery, have the best of the argument. It was, however, a divine expedient in the unfoldment of revelation to withhold compulsion and the absolute enforcement of the highest principles in waiting on the slower processes of growth and education to accomplish their work.

The idea of HOLINESS, though the most conspicuous, was not the only element in the Jewish conception of character. Along with it, on the pages of the Old Testament, there gleamed forth another representative word, viz: "righteousness." There is a noble filling out of this word in the historical and prophetical writings of that book. It is distinguished from holiness in that it indicates right conduct in human relationships rather than inward purity under special divine influence. The sense of justice and equity was very strong among the ancient Hebrews. The ideal of an upright judge plays a conspicuous part in Abraham's grand appeal, "Will not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The same thought stands out in that sublime oracle, "Justice and judgment are the habitations of his throne." Innocence, freedom from wrong doing, is another characteristic word. "I shall be innocent from the great transgression." The

crime of David against Micah was a natural event in the life of an eastern king. What gives eminence to the Jewish story is the stern reprobation of the prophet and the profound repentance of David. Compassion for the poor and afflicted is enforced throughout the Old Testament. It is under this form that some of the patriarchal and Jewish saints rose to the lofty and comprehensive "charity" of the after-dispensation. The sterner and more heroic virtues were passionately extolled. Rectitude, fidelity to duty, the rebuke of wickedness in high places, heroism and patriotism, and the denunciation of all forms of vice, were conspicuous qualities in the Jewish ideal of manhood. Now and then, as in Isaiah, there were wonderful outbursts of tenderness and sympathy.

The principal defect in the Jewish conception of morality is seen in relation to their treatment of evil-doers. In their stern indignation against sin and manly hatred of evil-doing they often forgot to discriminate between the transgressor and the transgression. Their personal enemies, especially, were dealt with in a spirit of unsparing rigor. A few passages evolved from the higher moods of prophetic inspiration grandly taught the Christian lesson of returning good for evil. But the characteristic Jewish sentiment lay towards the punishment of wrong-doers, with little thought of their reclamation. A terrible Oriental vindictiveness occasionally breaks forth in the Psalms, and David evidently thought it a righteous thing to curse his enemies with the bitterest imprecations. In the Jewish conception of God, mercy and

forgiveness were very prominent, but failed of strong reproduction in their idea of human character.

Thus far I have considered the Old Testament ideal of moral excellence from the human side; but every where there is manifest a vivid impression of Divine influence. With the Jews the worship of Jehovah instead of Baal was not a question merely of religious feeling. It was the choice of purity instead of vileness and pollution. The worship of the heathen divinities connected itself with all kinds of impurity. The Greek and Roman gods were bad enough, but these were pure in comparison with some of the gods set up to rival Jehovah. It was this fact that gave significance to the incessant, terrible lessons against idolatry with which the Old Testament abounds. All the way through, Jewish history and theology are strongly marked with the union of spiritual worship and right-living. This union is its glory. And whenever in their Sacred Books the spiritual element is conspicuous, the moral element is equally strong. It was these two things which to the Hebrew mind, at its best, were so closely blended—the thought of God and the thought of goodness—it is these ideas intensely felt and nobly expressed that make the Psalms and the best of the prophets fruitful and precious in all ages. The ceremonial element in Judaism often confused the moral sense, and at times crowded it into the background. There is nothing more striking than the frequent protests of psalmists and prophets against its excessive predominance. "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken

spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." The greatest spirits of the Old Dispensation rose above the religion of forms and ceremonies; but the ritualistic tendency in the Jewish nature was very strong, and during the age of prophetic silence, up to the advent of Christ, it had largely crushed out the more spiritual elements. Coming now to the appearance of Christ, his attitude to Judaism, and his relation to the Old Testament, the evolutionary character of revelation is distinctly seen when we compare and contrast his teaching, in its essential features, with that of the old religion. Though it may be said that Christianity, in all that is peculiar to it, originated with Christ, it is essentially the development of a pre-existing germ. It is not a continuation of Judaism, enlarged, modified and animated by a new spirit, but an outgrowth of the old stock, somewhat as the living tree is an outgrowth of the decaying seed from which it springs. The fact that the best fruit of philosophy and the highest results of the moral thought and experience of mankind were incorporated in the Christian scheme detracts nothing from its Divine authority, nor does it in any way affect its claim to originality. If the skeptical critics of our time could establish their boasted assertion that the religion of Christ is but a gathering up of the occasional gleams of light that broke out along the line of human progress, by the natural growth and culture of its moral instincts, it would be for that reason no less a Divine religion. The Gospel is not an absolute creation, viewed as a product of the mind of Christ, but rather a new combination and direction of already-

existing forces. Contemplating the life of Christ in its historical aspects, and in the moral bearing on the religion of humanity, there is nothing more striking than his twofold relation to the earlier Judaism. In him we see a flowering out of the old religion in fullest beauty, and the introduction of principles not only new but radically different from the old. The *person* of Christ is simply transcendent when compared with even the highest of the race. Paul, whose portrait stands by the side of his Master's, we recognize as "a king amongst men," the very tallest of the race, but even this magnificent man, this epochal genius, pales before the luster that shines from the person of Jesus. It is by a like comparison that we get a new sense of the incomparable truth which he brought to light when we compare it with the best that had gone before.

We have already seen that the fundamental characteristic of the earlier Judaism was the union of devout feeling with righteous living. We have seen on the one hand a strong tendency to excess in ritualism, and on the other, the inculcation of a lofty, spiritual morality. We have seen, likewise, that the root idea of the Jewish religion was consecration to God, and the expression of that consecration by separation from the world. In this we find the starting point of Christ's teaching and the key to his mission. He gave to the idea of right living a comprehensiveness, a clearness, and a depth that wonderfully enlarges the old Jewish conception. In the Sermon on the Mount he gives to the moral principles of the law an application at once so profound and searching that it may

almost be said that the human conscience dates a new birth from that hour. The law condemned gross and obvious forms of evil, but Christ threw the light of his moral consciousness on the subtler sins of the heart. As the only effectual cure he aimed at the utter extinction of the germs of evil by purifying its source. This was but carrying out the highest aims of the old religion. We can imagine the heroes of the old time, had they been permitted to hear the Great Teacher, welcoming these masterly expositions as the fuller and clearer expression of the message given them to deliver.

A most striking example of the far-reaching wisdom of Christ's method is seen in the attitude he assumed towards the ceremonialism of the Mosaic law. He lived in outward conformity to the ritual of the Jewish church. He not only did not attempt summarily to abolish its forms, but submitted to them when necessary. His own emphatic declaration was, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law; I have not come to destroy but to fulfill." The law was not a permanent institution. Being symbolic and typical, it made provision in itself for its own termination. The Sabbatical restrictions he disregarded appear to have been the casuistical refinements of Pharisees and no part of the original law. Being under the Mosaic Ritual, the divine constitution of the nation, he complied with its ceremonial as well as its moral requirements. Yet he planted seeds that, springing up quickly, threw aside the grosser elements of Judaism as an up-springing shoot pushes aside a pebble. Moved by considerations of a wise and far-

reaching policy, he retained for the time the outward form, but laid such eminent stress on the importance of *spiritual worship* and *right-living* that the cumbrous ritual of the old religion fell away and perished, only to be revived when the church sinks into a condition of lethargy and spiritual death. He found the Jews subject to a most elaborate code of precepts, many of which were based on trifling distinctions as destitute of divine authority as they were of moral significance. Their aim was to live by the Statute Book. In the long interval of prophetic silence the old spirit had died. The spiritual wealth and moral earnestness of prophetic teaching had given way to the cold and plodding deliverances of rabbinical doctors. The test of a religious life was conformity to the thousand regulations laid down in the Book of Moses, to which was added the traditions of the fathers. All along it was the aim of Christ to absolutely supersede this whole legal system. And not only did the ceremonial part disappear, but its multitude of moral precepts were all replaced by a single great principle. The Jews were held to a minutely prescribed routine of life. The Christian is set absolutely free from everything but the law of love, and the law of the *spirit of life* in Christ Jesus. The work of Christ was, therefore, one of emancipation. In nothing does the sympathy between Christ and the teachers of the old religion more obviously appear than in this thought of spiritual worship, which was in both. Even their very language lent itself as the appropriate expression of his deepest experiences. It was in his moment of supremest suffering that he exclaimed in the language

of the Psalmist: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

But Christ introduced a remarkable change in the idea of man's relation to God. It was he who first distinctly taught that the Divine goodness was the model for human goodness. In the Jewish conception of Jehovah there was a strong incentive to justice, uprightness and purity, but so predominant was the feeling of reverence and awe, that the thought of ex pressly imitating Him—of reproducing the essential qualities of His moral character—did not occur even to the best of them. But Christ presented that idea of likeness to God as the supreme motive to right-living. In his teaching, while the idea of God loses nothing in august purity, and that awfulness that belongs to perfect goodness, it gains infinitely in tenderness and sympathy. The characteristic Jewish title of the Jehovah was the I AMS, the Infinite. He was Lord, King, Judge, Governor, Architect, incased in impenetrable majesty, compassing infinitude with a span, presiding over boundless empire, governing worlds. In the discourses of Christ the habitual name was "Father." In his use of this term lies the solution of the problem of the ages. In thus accenting and familiarizing the conception of the Fatherhood of God, and its correlative, the brotherhood of man, it may be said that Christ introduced a new religion upon earth. The incarnation of the Word, the manifestation of God in the flesh, brought about a more intimate connection between man and the Divine Father than had ever existed in former dispensations. The relation of father and child is but the feeblest

illustration of the closeness and preciousness of this divine connection. Part of the meaning of that name lay in this—as the child grows up in the likeness of its father, so man is to grow up in the likeness of God. Thus Christ uses the thought: "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use and persecute you, *that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven;* for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust. . . . *Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.*" By this figure of father and child, together with every variety of instruction and the utmost intensity of application, Christ set the Divine goodness before men as the very ideal toward which they were to rise. He did more than this. He taught the indwelling of God in man. The absolute sense of the nearness of the visible to the invisible, the value of the human soul, and the supremacy of the spiritual universe, was no less a fact of consciousness than the most certain and demonstrable verities of material nature. He taught that the true relation of the soul to God was the relation of inmost love. This thought—at once the sublimest and tenderest that the human mind can conceive—conspicuous in the beginning, shone out more and more with increasing power as our Master approached the end of his earthly life. As the time of his departure drew near he seemed to rise at times into a more vivid consciousness of his Divine nature, and the lessons that descend upon us from these closing scenes, as depicted in

those profoundly spiritual discourses of John's Gospel, are exquisitely poetical and tender in their exaltedness. To the loftier spirits of the old religion there was opened at times a communion with God that yielded a supreme sense of strength and joy. But the life of Christ was radiant with this communion. It was this that shed so wonderful and heavenly a luster upon his figure. In him all nobility of character, all profound experience, reaching to the inmost recesses of moral consciousness, all delicacy of feeling and depth of affection, and the noblest self-denial, had as their background a divine presence. "In him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." Immanuel—God with us.

But for the most radical contrast between Christianity and the old religion out of which it sprang, we must consider the idea of expulsion—separation—which all along was a fundamental characteristic of Judaism. Both in their ecclesiastical and political relations the Jews took the lead in exclusiveness and bigotry. Even the best of them were incapable of grasping the sentiment of universal philanthropy, the peculiar glory of Christ's religion. The exclusiveness of the Jew was most conspicuous in his national sentiment. To him the foreigner was unworthy of fellowship unless he took on himself the obligations and insignia of a Jew. His sympathies were compressed within the narrow limits of a single nationality. It required four thousand years to educate the world to the point of comprehending the glorious fact of the universality of the divine love. In the beautiful unfolding of God's plan we have the religion of an

individual, the religion of a family, the religion of a nation, and the religion of a world. It remained for the Redeemer of mankind to rise above all sectional and national prejudices, and in the exercise of divine sympathy and boundless suffrage, to offer salvation and spiritual heirship to all men everywhere. But even in this he wrought his work slowly. It was left for Peter to give forth the grand oracle: "I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that fears God and works righteousness is accepted of him;" and for Paul to declare, "There is neither Jew nor Greek." The whole matter lay wrapped up in the parable of the Good Samaritan, and was actually developed in the Great Commission.

We are enabled more fully to appreciate the revolution which Christ inaugurated when we look at his treatment of sinners and outcasts among his own people. Here more than anywhere else, he went right in the face of the sentiments and instincts of respectable Jews. "*He receiveth sinners and eateth with them.*" This, to Jewish respectability, was the unpardonable sin. Christ, elsewhere so prudent and cautious, pauses not at this point for conciliation or compromise with Jewish intolerance. This it seems was a truth so important, so central, so vital, that it was necessary from first to last to give it the strongest expression of which words and acts were capable. "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." "The Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." It all lay in this. Human brotherhood, Divine fatherhood—all that is noblest, sweetest,

best—is the lesson of which the life and death of Jesus is an unbroken and incomparable manifestation. A sinner is not something to be hated, but something to be saved. *God so loved the world.* Disinterestedness and love are the crowning attributes of God. Forgive your enemies as God forgives you. Do good to the evil and the unthankful, as your Father sends rain and sunshine on the wicked no less than on the righteous. Love your very murderers, pray for them, forgive them, and look to your Father to forgive them.

Here is where the religion of Christ takes its essential departure from Judaism and all lower forms of religion and morality. To the Jew religion meant consecration to God expressed by separation from sin and sinful men. With Christ it meant union with God in love that goes out to save all men from evil. The lower religion terminates on self—at most on one's own church or nation. The higher is not self-focused nor church-centered, but world-wide in its sympathies and schemes of benevolence, sending forth as its characteristic word of invitation to the race: "*Whosoever* will, let him come and take of the fountain of the water of life freely."

A word only may be given to the great subject of immortality. Having been distinctly implied in all that has gone before in this essay, it needs but a word to remind you how this transcendent and immeasurable truth, which breaks out at most only in faint and fitful gleams in the older teaching, shines full and clear in the life of Jesus, and finds in his own rising from the grave its visible pledge and clear demonstration.

Divine revelation, which was four thousand years in

process of development, reaches its culmination in Christ, and these mighty truths concerning God and man, and human character and destiny, as determined by man's relation to God, that run through the Bible, may be compared to the course of the Mississippi river through the central valley of the American Continent. The great river takes its rise in the North and runs like a silver thread through the New World. In the West it is bounded by open prairies, in the South it winds beneath precipitous heights, rolls through marshy swamps, and is fringed here and there with dense jungle and heavy forests. It has no regular width, depth or straightness. In one place it thunders through a mountain gorge, in another it is as calm as the upper deep on a summer's day. In one place it is narrow, in another broad. Here it is shallow enough to ford; yonder it is deep enough to float the great Eastern. Yet from its source to its confluence with the Gulf of Mexico it is gradually augmented by tributary streams. So these great truths of infinite love, rising in the bowers of Eden, rolled on through the broad expanse of human history, wound their course through the mountains of promise, plunged into the jungles of prophecy, and reappear at last, clothed in glory, and washing the shores of immortality in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

This great river may change its bed, modify its course, deepen its channel, augment its volume—may straighten a curve or curve a straightness—but the river itself is as lasting as the world through which it flows, and after the world and time it will form a part of the great ocean of the endless after-time. In God's revelation to man there is nothing transient

but *method* and *form;* in *substance* it is eternal, for truth in its essence is as imperishable as its Author. *Inspiration* was transient because it was the *method* of *revelation;* miracles were transient because they were the *method* of *authentication* of the truth revealed; all *symbolism* has in it an element of transiency because the truth symbolized may, and sometimes *must*, exist apart from its symbol. All forms are necessarily symbolical and constitute no *essential* part of the truth of which they are but the outward representation. When the truth has been communicated by inspiration, authenticated and certified by miracles, and its earlier forms of manifestation and preservation outgrown by expanding life and new conditions of growth, the old forms and methods drop away and perish, except as historic testimonials of the truth and development of spiritual life. The religion of Jesus Christ is not and never can be so hampered with stereotyped forms as not to freely assimilate with all new discoveries of truth. Its traditional form may change, as it has many times changed before; but the Spirit of Jesus Christ—the religion of Divine love dwelling in men, inspiring them towards perfect manhood, and gathering all into one family, of which God is the Father and Christ the Elder Brother—that religion is immortal. "And now ABIDETH *faith*, *hope* and *love*, these three . . . but the greatest of these is *love*."

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

J. W. M'GARVEY.

The subject assigned me is too large to be set forth in all its bearings in a single lecture; and the controversies in regard to it which have existed for many centuries, have raised so many questions, that to dispose of them all even briefly, would require a volume instead of a lecture. I am not expected to undertake so great a task. The discussion called for is one adapted, not to the world at large, but to the members of the Lectureship, and to the churches which they represent. To their minds many of these mooted questions have been settled; so I address myself to the discussion of those only on which they entertain some differences of opinion. I am glad to have an opportunity to take part in this discussion; for I am aware, as you all are, that the only way to settle disputed points among thoughtful men, is to discuss them until that which is true is made to appear. Sometimes we become impatient with this process, and think that because we have ourselves settled certain questions, they are settled forever; forgetting, as we should never do, that every question must be settled by each succeeding generation for itself. Thus the church is ever learning, and always coming to the knowledge of the truth.

I. The chief points in regard to Church Govern-

ment, on which I suppose there is agreement among my hearers, and between all of them and myself, are these: (1) That the eldership (*presbuterion*) is the only permanent office of government in the individual congregations of the Lord. (2) That the titles, *presbuteeros*, elder, *episkopos*, overseer or bishop, and *poimeen* pastor or shepherd, belong alike to all the incumbents of this office. (3) That men are to be chosen for the office by the members of the church, and set apart to it by prayer and the imposition of hands with fasting. (4) That only those who possess the qualifications prescribed in the New Testament are eligible to the office. (5) That these officers are the authorized rulers, protectors and teachers of the church, not excluding teaching by other competent persons. Perhaps other points of agreement might be named, but these five are enough, I think, for our present purpose. With the bare mention of these, I shall proceed to speak of some on which there is more or less difference of opinion among us, and afterward of some things that are wanting in the work of the eldership at the present time.

II. Among the things concerning which there is want of agreement, I will first mention three of the qualifications for the office laid down by Paul; *viz.*, the age of the candidate, his family experience, and his ability to teach.

In reference to the first, considered apart from the second, we have no guide except the title elder and its correlatives. This term is an exact equivalent of the original *presbuteros*, being an adjective in the comparative degree, and meaning an older man. It came

into use as an official term from the selection of older men among the Hebrews as the city rulers under the law of Moses. In the New Testament its primary meaning clings to it so closely that it is not in every instance easy to determine whether it has this sense alone, or its official sense also. The Greek word is the correlative of *neaniskos*, young man, and is so used in Acts 2: 17, "Your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:" and in 1 Tim. 5: 1, "Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father; the young men as brothers." The lowest limit of age at which one could be called an elder can be best determined, I think, by ascertaining the limit within which a Jew was still called a young man. Now *neaniskos* is the diminutive of *neanios*, the term applied to Paul when he is called a "young" man at the time of stoning Stephen. But it is well ascertained that Paul was very nearly of the same age with Jesus, and that he must have been at the time over thirty years old. Again, Timothy was yet in his youth (*neotees*) when he was residing at Ephesus; for Paul writes to him, "Let no man despise thy *youth*." But this was written not earlier than the year 64, and Timothy commenced traveling with Paul early in the second tour of the latter, which began in the year 50. Timothy then had been a young preacher about fourteen years, and he must have been over thirty while still called a youth. Here then, by two examples, one in the life of the man who prescribed the qualifications in question, and the other in that of him to whom they were written, we ascertain that a man could not be regarded as an elder until he had passed into the neighborhood of forty years of age. No man, therefore, under this

age, was eligible to the office of elder, bishop or pastor.

As to the family experience of an elder, the expression "husband of one wife" has been construed in three different ways: (1) as excluding a man with a second wife, the first being dead; (2) as excluding only a man with two or more wives; (3) as excluding the latter and one with no wife. The numeral one attached to wife, certainly cuts off more than one; and about this there is no difference of opinion. That it excludes a man with a second wife, I cannot believe, because as he is no longer the husband of the deceased wife, he is the husband of only one. Does it exclude the man with no wife? It seems to me quite certain that it does. A man with one eye, one hand, one foot, is not a man who has no eye, no hand, no foot. If he is a man of one friend, one house, one farm, he is certainly not without a friend, a house, a farm. So, if he is the husband of one wife, he is not the husband of no wife. Further proof of this is found in the assumption which Paul makes that the candidate for the eldership has a family. He describes him as "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity;" and he adds: "If a man knoweth not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the house of God?" Again, in prescribing the qualifications, he says: "If any man is blameless, the husband of one wife, having children that believe, who are not accused of riot, or unruly." To be an elder, bishop, pastor, then, a man must be married, and the father of believing children. If you call any one a pastor

who has not all these qualifications, you miscall him—you employ a scriptural term unscripturally.

It has been very often objected to these obvious conclusions, that they cannot be correct, because they cut off Paul and Timothy both from the eldership. It cannot be denied that they do; and doubtless Paul and Timothy saw this as plainly as you and I can see it. But what of it? Were they elders? If so, we would be compelled to think there is someting wrong in our readings, or in our conclusions. No; their offices were quite distinct from that of the elder; and it follows that the elder may have had *duties* to perform requiring him to be a man of family, which Paul and Timothy had not. And this is true. In exercising the oversight of a congregation composed largely of women, young and old, there are duties, too often most wofully neglected in modern times to the shame and confusion of the church, which only married men can discharge, and which require the greatest delicacy even on their part. I have had such duties to discharge in my own experience quite a number of times, and I could not have touched them had I been an unmarried man.

As to the third qualification of which I am to speak, the expression, "apt to teach," is the rendering of the single Greek word *didaktikos*. This word is difficult to render for want of an English equivalent. If we had a correlative of the word teachable, to represent the disposition of the teacher, as this word does that of the person willing to be taught, it would render *didaktikos* with precision. In the absence of it, our translators have done the best they could by using the old adjective *apt* with the infinitive, *to teach*. It does

not mean *skillful* in teaching, as some seem to understand it; but readiness, promptness, willingness to teach. This is made clear by the context in the only other occurrence of the word in the New Testament, 2 Tim 2: 24: "The Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle towards all, apt to teach, forbearing, in meekness correcting them that oppose themselves." Here it expresses a disposition which is to be maintained toward opponents; and it requires Timothy, in contradistinction from strife, to be *ready to teach*. It would, of course, be vain to require a man to be ready to teach, if he were not able to teach. Consequently, while the idea of capability is not expressed in the word, it is implied. The elder, then, must be capable of teaching, and must be ready and prompt to give instruction to those in his flock who need it.

What teaching is this? It is not preaching; for preaching was addressed to the world, not to the church, and the elder's work as an elder was confined to the church. It is evidently the teaching prescribed in the second part of the apostolic commission: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you." To this extent, then, the work of elders was co-ordinate with that of the apostles, and the way in which it was done we may in part gather from the way in which the apostles did the same work. Paul describes his own method when he says to the elders of Ephesus concerning his labors in that city, "I shrank not from declaring unto you anything that was profitable, and teaching you publicly and from house to house." This he places before them as an example; and thus we learn that they were directed to teach from house to house as well as in public.

Both of these methods are indispensable in taking care of a congregation; the one, for reaching the greatest number at one time; and the other, for the greatest personal effect on individuals, and especially for reaching those who neglect the public assembly. We can not doubt that teaching in both methods was observed by the eldership of every apostolic church; and we would infer that ability to do both was a necessary qualification for every elder, but for one passage which clearly shows that this was not the case. It is the well known passage (1 Tim. 4: 17), "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially those who labor in the word and in teaching." In the direction that those who rule well shall be counted worthy of double honor, it is implied that there were some who did not rule well, and that the latter should have less honor. But besides these there were some who, in addition to ruling well, "labored in the word and in teaching." This latter expression is by common consent understood to mean laboring in public addresses to the church, and perhaps also to the world. These especially are to be counted worthy of double honor, and evidently because they fill to the fullest measure the qualifications and duties of the elder's office. But, in as much as those who teach privately, do teach, and if they teach promptly and willingly, they comply with the requirement, "apt to teach," it can not be denied that, although this class of elders were not regarded as worthy of the honor bestowed on the third class, there was such a class, and those of them who *ruled* well were counted worthy of double honor as compared with those who did not. I think, then, that however desirable it is to have elders

who can discharge in the most efficient manner every function of the office, it is unscriptural and wrong to decry elders who are not efficient public speakers, provided they do the ruling and the private teaching which belong to their office. And if a church has one or two elders who can teach in public, and one or two others who can teach only in private, while all are faithful in discharging the other duties of the office, such a church is well-equipped for the work of the Lord.

Next after the three qualifications which I have discussed, I may mention as a subject of some dispute, the number of elders which each congregation should have. The universal fact of a plurality in the apostolic churches has naturally led to the almost universal conviction that the will of the Lord requires a plurality now. Undoubtedly the work then required a plurality or we should have found at least some intimation of the contrary. It is probable that the public teaching could in most instances have been done as well, if not better, by a single elder, the most effective one of the number; but faithful and sufficient private teaching required a plurality, and still more did the demands of faithful discipline. Where questions of right and wrong between men are to be decided, and the law enforced upon the wrong-doer, it has always been found best to have a plurality of rulers. In these f[illegible]d co[illegible]derations there is sufficient ground [illegible]rin[illegible] well-established conviction of the [illegible]t e[illegible]ch shall have, if possible, a plu[illegible]elde[illegible]ently, no one person is [illegible] bi[illegible] the church, and

such phraseology ought to be banished from our vocabulary.

At this point we must consider the objection, that the plurality of elders everywhere apparent in the apostolic churches is due to the fact that in every city the number of disciples was too great for all to meet in one place—that a number of different congregations, therefore, met at different places, and that this necessitated the appointment of as many elders as congregations, so that each should enjoy the oversight of one elder. These congregations, it is claimed, constituted the one church of the city, and these elders the eldership of that one church. Thus the theory of one elder to a congregation is made to harmonize with the fact of a plurality of elders to every church. I do not see that this supposed state of facts would alter the case at all, unless you advance to the further supposition, that these elders ruled their several congregations independently of one another, as did those in different cities; and that in case such a church afterward obtained a house large enough for all, they dismissed all the elders but one. With these additional suppositions you would have the rule of one elder to the church, but not otherwise. But the main supposition is itself untenable. In the first place, there is not the slightest intimation in the Scriptures that this is the reason for appointing a plurality of elders in every church. Secondly, it is highly improbable that in the hundreds of small towns and villages throughout Judea, Samaria, Galilee, Syria, Asia Minor and Greece, the number of disciples was so great as this theory requires us to believe. Thirdly, we have evidence from Scripture statements that it was not true

of Jerusalem, of Corinth, of Ephesus and of Troas, all large cities except the last. In Jerusalem the disciples did meet together in one place, the temple court, as we read in many passages of Acts. In Corinth, after Paul left the synagogue, he held his meetings in the house of Titus Justus; and when he wrote to the church several years later he ordered them to assemble together and deliver the incestuous man over to Satan; and he speaks of the whole church being assembled together, *epi to auto*, in their ordinary meetings for edification (1 Cor. 5: 4; 14: 23). In Ephesus he preached two whole years after leaving the synagogue, in the schoolhouse of Tyrannus, and when he was about to leave the city after the mob of the silversmiths, he called the disciples together and exhorted them (Acts 19: 9, 10; 20: 1). In Troas the disciples came together in one upper room to break bread (Acts 20: 7). Thus we see that the theory in question is based upon a false assumption as to the facts in the case, and we are thrown back upon the view which lies on the surface of the history, that every separately organized congregation was supplied with a plurality of elders.

I next take up the much-mystified question of the relation of the evangelist to the church and its eldership. Who the evangelist is can be determined by the titles applied to him, and the terms used to distinguish his work. Take Timothy as a typical example. He is called an evangelist (2 Tim. 4: 5), and a minister (1 Tim. 4: 6; 1 Thes. 3: 2). He is told to preach and to teach (2 Tim. 4: 2; 1 Tim. 4: 11), which shows that he was a preacher and a teacher. The term "evangelist" means one who publishes the good tid-

ings of salvation, and the term "minister" means a servant, or one who serves in some capacity. These two terms are applied to Jesus and to the apostles as well as to persons like Timothy, and the last is the distinctive title of those whom we call deacons; but neither of them is ever applied to an elder; neither is an elder once in the New Testament said to evangelize, to preach, or to serve. We may not infer from this that because a man was an elder he had not the *right* to evangelize or preach, or that he rendered no *service*. It is to be accounted for rather on the ground that his distinctive work was ruling, not serving; and teaching, not preaching. Still, this circumstance is worthy of note as exhibiting quite a contrast between scriptural usage and that which has sprung up among us. While the terms "preacher" and "pastor" are never in the New Testament applied to the same person, they are constantly so applied by some of us.

Did the evangelist have a place as such in the congregation which was fully supplied with elders? This question is now answered in the negative by two classes among us, who are antipodes on most questions, and even on this in which they seem to be agreed. They are those who, on the one hand, would keep the evangelist constantly on the move holding protracted meetings; and those, on the other, who would settle him down permanently in the congregation as its pastor, or at least as its principal pastor, and not allow him when thus settled to be called any longer an evangelist. Both go on the assumption that a New Testament evangelist was of necessity a traveling preacher. Now, I think there can be no doubt that when an evangelist has the qualifications for the

eldership, and when it appears wise for him to settle in one place for a protracted period, he may with propriety be set apart as one of the elders. We have no instance of this on record, but we must infer it from the freedom which the church enjoyed in selecting her rulers. But did the evangelist, as an evangelist, have a place and a work within the congregation, not limited by the demands of a "protracted meeting?" It is plainly taught that he did. Here again the example of Timothy serves our chief purpose, for the reason, I think, that we happen to know more about him than any other evangelist. He was left in Ephesus, a church fully supplied with elders, just previous to the date of the first epistle to Timothy, which was written, according to the received chronology, in the year 64; and he remained there until Paul, in 68, the year of his death, sent Tychicus to take his place and requested him to come to Rome (1 Tim. 1: 3; 2 Tim. 4: 9, 12). His residence there covered at least four years, nearly an average stay for a preacher in our own day. He was not there as a pastor, or an elder, but as an evangelist; for Paul exhorts him in reference to the work in which he was engaged, "Do the work of an evangelist, fulfil thy ministry" (2 Tim. 4: 5). In the same connection, and with reference to the same work, he says: "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long suffering and teaching.' In short, every duty is laid on Timothy that was laid on the elders, with the single exception of that of ruling. With this exception his work was co-ordinate

with theirs. This, then, is the New Testament idea of the work of an evangelist when laboring in connection with an eldership within the bounds of a congregation. Timothy is not the only evangelist, as we have reason to believe, who thus labored. Luke was left at Philippi, as we judge by the absence of "we" from his narrative, from the time of the first establishment of the church there, in the year 51, till Paul started on his last journey to Jerusalem, in 58, a period of nearly seven years (Acts 16: 16, 19, 40; 20: 6); and when Paul reached Cæsarea on that journey, he found Philip "the evangelist" residing in that city. We can reasonably infer that the labors of these two evangelists in these two cities were much of the same character as those of Timothy in Ephesus.

On a moment's reflection it is easy to see that such an arrangement as this is wise at times, if not even a necessity. Any church, with even a good and efficient eldership, is liable to have enemies in its vicinity too strong for its elders; it is liable in the vicissitudes of its career to have less efficient elders at one time than at another; it is likely to have in reach of its ministrations a large number of the ungodly who can be won to Christ more easily by powerful preaching than by the teaching of its elders; and for any or all of these reasons, it may scripturally have in addition to the work of its elders, that of an evangelist. Even a young evangelist, with neither the experience nor the age required for the eldership, may do an excellent work under such circumstances; but let it be borne in mind that he does not, by such labor, become a pastor or shepherd of the flock. He is still an evangelist; he is one of the flock, and the pastors have rule over

him. Such was the case of Timothy at Ephesus.

Here I have touched another mooted question, to which it may be well to devote a little space. From a misinterpreted remark of Paul to Timothy, it has been inferred by some that an evangelist had authority to call the elders to account, and to rebuke them for their sins. It is the remark, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear." (1 Tim. 5: 19, 20). This is supposed to mean that Timothy was to hear accusations against elders, for the purpose of bringing them before himself for trial; and that if he found any of them guilty of sin, he was to reprove them in the presence of the whole congregation. But that this cannot be Paul's meaning is proved by the fact that at the beginning of the chapter, he says to Timothy, "Rebuke not an elder, but exhort him as a father." In this latter instance, the word elder probably means merely an elderly man; but if Timothy was forbidden to rebuke an elder in years, he would certainly not be required to reprove one who was an elder in years and also in office. Furthermore, the term "them" in the passage in question does not find its antecedent in the word elder, as this interpretation requires, for the very obvious reason that the two words differ in number. If this meaning had been intended, then after the words, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses," we should have had, "*Him* that sins reprove," and not *them* that sin. The facts are that there is no pronoun expressed in the Greek; and that Paul, after saying what he does of charges

against an elder, in the next sentence introduces a new topic, that of reproving in the presence of the whole church such members in general as are guilty of sin; from which rebuke, however, elders are expressly excepted in a preceding verse. It may be asked, Why receive accusations against elders at all, unless he was to try them? The obvious answer is, that in as much as he was doing a work in co-operation with the elders, and to a great extent co-ordinate with theirs, it would be very natural for persons disaffected toward any one of the elders to pour their accusations into his ears, in order that he might bring them before the other elders for trial. I presume that there are few evangelists of much experience among us now who have not been compelled often to listen to such accusations.

Not only is subordination of the elders to the evangelist not taught in the passage just considered, but the reverse is taught in other places. One reason given to Titus why elders ought to be able to convict the gainsayers, is, that "there are many unruly men, vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not for filthy lucre's sake." These were unruly evangelists, and the only way to stop their wide mouths was to convict them as gainsayers—not *convince* them; for such fellows can never be convinced; but to *convict* them, which means to convince the brethren as to who they are, and thus stop their mouths by depriving them of hearers. This, by the by, is the only way to stop the mouth of any man in our free country, and we ought not to want any other.

Again, the elders of the church at Ephesus were put on the watch of all evangelists who might visit their flock, and required to stand guard against any who were unworthy. Paul said to them: "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Wherefore watch ye, remembering that by the space of three years I ceased not to admonish every one night and day with tears." (Acts 20: 29-31.) We learn from the supplementary account of this church contained in the brief epistle addressed to it nearly thirty years afterward, that these elders and their successors were faithful to this solemn charge: for the Lord says, "I know thy works, and thy toil and patience, and that thou canst not bear evil men, and didst try them who call themselves apostles, and they are not, and didst find them false." (Rev. 2: 2.) Men who dared to call themselves apostles must have been venerable men with no mean appearance of piety and wisdom. This was a part of the work of elders as shepherds of the flock; for the hireling, when he seeth the wolf coming, leaveth the sheep and fleeth, and the wolf catcheth them and scattereth them; but the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep. Jno. 10: 11, 12.

The first innovation on this apostolic order of church government, which is traceable in history, consisted not in the displacement of the eldership, or in a change of its character and functions, but in subordinating it to the resident evangelist, making him the chief ruler, and ascribing to him alone the title *sepikopos*, "bishop," which had hitherto belonged

to every elder. The certain existence of this order is first found in the writings of Irenæus, who wrote in the last quarter of the second century; unless we admit the genuineness of the Ignatian epistles, which were written, if genuine, in the first or second decade of that century. If three of the fourteen of these epistles are genuine, as is supposed by many eminent Protestant scholars, Ignatius may be regarded as the first advocate of this innovation, if not the originator of it. He presses the subject of obedience to the bishop with vehemence, often dragging it in without regard to the connection of thought, and thus he betrays the untempered zeal of a convert to an innovation. Doubtless the eleven epistles ascribed to him, which are undoubtedly spurious, and which abound still more in allusions to this subject, were written in great part for the purpose of emphasizing an order of government which, at the time of their date, had become common, but which still seemed to need the support of authoritative names. As such names were not found among the apostles, or among men like Clement of Rome, Polycarp and Justin Martyr, all of whose writings indicate the continuance of the apostolic order, Ignatius was seized upon as the single man of the first half of the second century whose authority could be plausibly claimed for separating the bishopric from the eldership.

III. In the third and last division of this address, I propose to speak of things that are wanting in the present work of the eldership, and of the steps which appear to me necessary to set these things in order. It is my conviction, as a result of wide-spread and long-continued observation, that the heaviest burden

under which the cause of Christ groans to-day is the worldliness and wickedness that abound everywhere in the churches. The assaults of infidelity and rationalism, serious as they are, are as nothing in comparison. This state of things, not in the congregations of the disciples alone, but in all the so-called churches, is a silent but an almost universal rebellion against the Head of the church; for there are no commands more explicit or more emphatic than such as these: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us." (1 Thes. 3: 6.) "Now I write unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat. . . . Put away the wicked man from among yourselves." (1 Cor. 5: 11-13.) This state of things will work inevitable ruin by bringing the curse of God upon us unless it be corrected. Paul warned the Corinthians of the consequences of it by demanding of them, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" (1 Cor. 5: 6) and our Lord in dictating his epistle to the church at Pergamos, said: "I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there some that hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication. So hast thou also some that hold the teaching of the Nicolaitans in like manner. Repent therefore; or else I come to thee quickly, and I will make war against them with the sword of my mouth." (Rev. 2:

14-16.) In view of such warnings and threatenings as these, we have reason to tremble for the future of our churches; and I envy not the man, be he preacher, elder, or what not, who can look on and not be deeply concerned for our condition in this respect. What can be done to remedy the evil before it shall be remedied by the fierce judgments of God? I suggest a few steps which appear to me to be imperative.

(1) Secure the removal from office of all unworthy (morally unworthy) elders. Some such have been thoughtlessly chosen by the congregations; and some have become unworthy by bad habits acquired after their appointment. All such are Achans in the camp, paralyzing the power of God's army. They are as if Joshua himself, or Eleazar, had been the Achan; for it is treason in the very head of the government. With all prudence, but at all hazard, they must be removed from the holy office which they have desecrated.

(2) After purging the office, let us restore to activity the ruling power of the eldership, which has gone almost entirely into disuse. The elders must be called back from the deception imposed on them through a mistranslation of the word expressive of their duties as shepherds, and must learn that instead of "feeding" the flock with the homeopathic soup of a wearisome speech on the Lord's day, and thinking that their chief work is done, they must be real shepherds of the flock, teaching from house to house, warning the disobedient, securing the exclusion of the incorrigible, and walking before all in godly sincerity. Let them learn that they watch for souls as those who must give account; and that when one sheep strays from the

flock, they are to leave the ninety and nine, and go into the mountains for the one that is lost until they find it.

(3) As a means of bringing about this change, let the pulpit and the press make a specialty of crying aloud on the subject until it is accomplished. There is scarcely anything, good or bad, that cannot be brought about in this country by the united and persevering efforts of the pulpit and the press. They have done enough that is bad; let them go now to work and do this most needed good. We hear it said sometimes, in quarters from which it is not welcome, that the Reformation needs reforming; but in the particular of which we now speak, I think that every godly man among us must agree that the saying is true. Who will be our Moses to lead us through this wilderness? The Lord grant him to us very soon.

I would not be doing justice to my brethren of the eldership if I were to close this essay without saying to them and to those who are under them in the Lord some words more encouraging than most that I have read to you. I know of no class of men who, while living, are more worthy of profound respect than faithful elders of the church; and none more worthy of remembrance when they are gone to their reward. Their work is tenfold more trying to the patience than that of the preacher; and it requires a loftier moral courage to execute it with fidelity. There is joy and exhilaration in standing before a listening crowd to tell the story of redemption; and the true preacher finds no greater delight on earth than it affords. He finds too, social enjoyment of the purest kind, in going from house to house, that he may teach, encourage

and gently admonish both the young and the old; while in ministering to the sick and the dying he experiences the truth of his Lord's remark, that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

But to start out in search of the sinning, determined to deal with them faithfully, not knowing how coldly you may be received, or how contemptously you may be repulsed; this is a burden whose weight is only known to the faithful shepherd; and he can expect no diminution of its weight until he drops it when his life-work is done. No wonder that Paul exhorts the brethren concerning those elders who had gone to their reward, saying: "Remember them that had the rule over you, who spoke to you the word of the God; and, considering the issue of their life, imitate their faith." (Heb. 13: 7). It is worth all the burdens of a faithful stewardship to think of being thus remembered. No wonder, that in reference to the elders yet living, the same blessed apostle says to his brethren, "Obey them that have rule over you, and submit to them; for they watch in behalf of your souls, as they that shall give account." (Heb. 13: 17). Give account of souls—of souls put under your care, to keep them for the Lord who bought them, as a shepherd keeps his sheep! How solemn, how fearful the responsibility! Under the law of Moses, if a man was found dead near a city, and the murderer not known, the elders of the city whose business it was to prevent and to suppress crime, were required to come out to a rough valley, slay a heifer, wash their hands over it, and swear in the presence of officiating Levites, "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Forgive, O

Lord, thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and suffer not innocent blood to remain in the midst of thy people Israel." (Deut. 21: 1-9). But when a *soul* has been lost through neglect; when it is found cold in death outside or inside the church of God, and the elders shall be called to give account of it, what ceremony shall cleanse away the blood? How happy will the elders be who can say before the Lord, We are free from the blood of this man! For such elders there is a great reward. Peter has such in his mind when he says, "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am a fellow elder . . . be shepherds to the flock of God which is among you, . . . and when the chief shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive an unfading (amaranthine) crown of glory." (1 Pet. 5: 1-4). I love the music of the word amaranthine, which Peter with exquisite taste here uses, referring as it does to that fabled flower whose tints never grow dim, and whose foliage never ceases to be fresh and green. Nothing in heaven shall be more beautiful than this badge of honor on the brow of the faithful elder. And when I look away to the visions of glory vouchsafed to John the beloved, I see in a circle close about the throne of God, with none nearer except the mysterious cherubim, four and twenty smaller thrones; and on them, not apostles and prophets, not martyrs and reformers, but four and twenty elders, arrayed in white garments, and crowns of gold upon their heads. As a preacher I grudge them not. Let them wear the crowns; let them sit on the thrones; and let me stand afar off, and bow my head, and praise my God for the just reward which he has given to them.

THE LAW OF SPIRITUAL INTERACTION.

W. W. HOPKINS.

"So, then, my beloved, even as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure."—Phil. 2: 12, 13. Revised Version.

PREFACE.

When I say to you, my co-laborers in Christ, that in the discussion of this theme I am confronted with difficulties, I know that I shall have the sympathy of all who have thought along this line; and while I recognize the honor of a call to this place and task, I must confess to a feeling of oppression under the weight of attending responsibilities.

INTRODUCTION.

The world was never so hungry for knowledge as now; not for traditions and fables, but facts. It demands that every problem and proposition be analyzed by the scientific method, and the thinker who does not recognize this demand is no longer heard. We shall therefore adhere as closely to facts in this discussion as ability and circumstances may permit.

Substances and laws are foundation-stones in every

scientific process of thought. We sometimes come to a better knowledge of substance through their laws, and sometimes we attain to a better knowledge of laws through the known nature of substances. A knowledge of both substances and their laws is desirable.

PROPOSITION.

That which thinks, and thought,are different things; both are entities, but one is a cause, and the other an effect. That which thinks we call the spirit, the I am of the man. Of a spirit we can have no cognizance outside of its activities; yet, we cannot think of it other than as a substance, or an essence. The psychological and the Scriptural postulates are, that the human spirit *is an indestructible, self-acting agent.* Upon this basis we propose to conduct this investigation.

PREMISES.

The human spirit, being an indestructible agent, it follows that no spirit at death returns to God in the sense in which the body returns to dust. In death the body is dissolved, and its particles lost in nature's aggregate of matter; while the spirit retains its entity as a mental unit forever; its identity is never lost by dissolution, sublimation or fusion. All human spirits therefore, continue in distinction, as numerical units, endlessly. This leads us to conclude, secondly, that each human spirit is a new or primary creation. Science has never accounted for the first material atom, nor the first human spirit, independent of creative energy. The development of the human spirit from matter, or the reverse process, would be

no less miraculous than the creation of either from nothing. The principle set forth by the Savior when he said: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit," opposes the notion that spirit is an attribute, quality or emanation from matter.

The only plausible conclusion from all the premises yet discovered, is, that God created, *at least*, twice; first, the first *material* atom; and second, the first *human spirit*. But finding the first human spirit by creation does not help us to an understanding of the genesis of all the spirits brought into being since; the law of procreation is not equal to the task, independent of *continued* creative energy. If the human spirit be indestructible, it must also be indivisible; the divisibility of the human spirit admitted, mental degeneracy follows irresistibly in the absence of creative energy. Each spirit being indestructible, no one spirit ever was or ever can become a component of any other spirit. The birth of a child does not decrease the spirit of its parent on either side. If each spirit, at conception or birth, be taken out of either parent, as the "rib from Adam's side," creative energy alone could replace the subtraction from the parent spirit; and since new spirit essence must be created somewhere, on the principle that men "put new wine in new bottles, and new cloth in new garments," and that God always has in view the elevation of the race, it is presumable that the *new* spirit would get the benefit of the creation, instead of the parent. A human spirit upon the hypothesis given, can have no offspring, and hence it is, "that we are the offspring of God;" that he is "the Father of our

spirits." Presuming all human spirits to be fractional parts of the God-spirit does not change the problem. The numerical aggregate of finite minds is not the God-mind, nor any part of it. The God-mind is no less to-day than prior to the existence of the first finite mind. If each human spirit be "a spark from the mind of God," creative energy alone could preserve the Divine essence in that state and unity in which it is unchangeable, indestructible and indivisible. Creative energy cannot, therefore, be eliminated from the genesis of human spirits.

Conclusion third. Each human spirit brought into being increases the numerical aggregate of spirit entities and of spirit substance in God's domain. In material nature, the law of death preserves an equilibrium between growing bodies and the aggregate of matter in the universe. In the dissolution of dead bodies there is given back to the material universe all that growing bodies derive therefrom, so that nature is neither enriched nor impoverished thereby. The aggregate of matter in the universe is neither increased nor diminished by the process of growth in the organic world. We know of no such process in the spirit domain, there being no decay of the human spirit; no returning of its substance or essence back to some spirit resevoir, or chaotic spirit mass.

The human spirit, once in existence, its development or growth becomes an important factor in the discussion of this subject. If we adopt the theory (for the sake of the argument) that the human spirit and the human body have analogous forms, that there is first, an infant, then a medium, then an adult spirit stature, some account must be rendered for its accre-

tions. That which increases the material body existed prior to its incorporation therein, there being no creation, as the law of material interaction accounts for its growth. A human spirit could only grow in this manner by accretions of its own in kind, and as we know of no reservoir of spirit essence in the universe, or of mind dust in space, there remains no way to account for additions to a human spirit short of creative energy. If the spirit grows within and of itself, it must be self-creative, by virtue of an internal sovereign law; but if the increase comes from without, then are the laws of interaction and their functions involved. This is important, because if a human spirit is changed by addition to, subtraction from, or the conversion of its substance, the fact is vital to every moral and religious theory. In the two hemispheres, mind and matter, three laws of interaction are recognized; the physical, the psycho-physical, and the psychical. The first relates to the influence of matter upon matter; the second, to mind upon matter, and *visa versa;* the third to mind upon mind. Two of these interactive laws, the physical and the pscho-physical, are supposed to have dominion over the body; and two, the psycho-physical and the psychical, over the spirit. The law of material interaction transmits material particles from state to state, or from body to body, but cannot transmit spirit essence; it cannot transmit that which it does not control. This law, therefore, terminates in material bodies; its functions are fulfilled in the organization and dissolution of material bodies.

The law of psycho-physical interaction is a dark problem; its functions are not clearly definable. It

would be rash to say what God does, or does not transmit to the human spirit by this law, but if he uses it for the transmission of spirit essence, we are unconscious of the fact. If matter is transmitted to spirit, or spirit to matter, or if either element is converted into the other in the transmission, the fact is unknown to science. The human body may be responsible for many of the moods of the spirit within, but it is next to a certainty that neither body nor spirit supplies each the other with the particles whereby their respective statures are increased. The transmission of spirit essence cannot, therefore, be one of the functions of the law of psycho-physical interaction.

The law of psychical interaction would be the more natural and presumable instrument by which God works upon the human spirit. But there is no psychical interaction between an infant and exterior minds for quite a long period of time; so that in whatever sense its spirit grows after its conception, and prior to its ability to make use of the law of psychical interaction, it cannot be attributed to that law. This proves conclusively that the transmission of spirit essence, if transmissible, is not a function of the law of psychical interaction. Of the three laws of interaction, therefore, we are reasonably certain that neither one of them transmits spirit essence. The theory of growth in the substance and stature of a human spirit cannot, therefore, be maintained, at least upon any interactive law.

The only sense in which it is revealed to us that a spirit grows, is in strength or forcefulness. It is said of the child Jesus that he grew "and waxed

strong in spirit." There is then a distinction to be made between a spirit growing in stature, and growing in strength. As the spirit increases in strength, there is a corresponding increase in wisdom; the strength of the spirit is its capacity for knowledge. It is said that "Jesus waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom." "Jesus increased in wisdom with age, and in favor with God." For the sake of being understood rather than of being metaphysical, let us divide the spirit-man into a triune of parts, to-wit, substance, mind and knowledge; or, essence, action and thought. The substance is that which thinks, the action of the substance is the mind; hence a weak or a strong mind; mind growth, and mental development. It is the action and not the substance that increases in the human spirit. The mind, therefore, is a thing of growth or development, one of the aids of which is the law of psychical interaction. It is in this sense alone that we can discern the spirit's "growth in grace and in the knowledge of the truth." It is in this sense that the human mind is depended, and dependent upon food; truth is to the mind as is bread to the body. It is in this sense that Jesus said, "A man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." The character into which a spirit solidifies with age depends upon the quality of its mental food; and this again depends upon the source from whence the food comes, or agents with whom the spirit interacts. Spiritual interaction is not the transmission of spirit substance from the Divine mind to the human spirit, but of truth, its most healthful and invigorating food. Spiritual attainments are not there-

fore, questions of addition, subtraction or conversion to, from, or of, spirit's substance, nor of its geographical nearness to the Divine Spirit, but of spiritual interaction with God. Instantaneous spiritual reconstruction is one of the delusions of the religious world. It is of the interactive relations sustained with God, of which the spirit needs to be conscious, and not of alterations in its substance, nor of the presence of a supernatural person in the same body therewith. The revelation of truth then is the great function of the law of psychical interaction.

THE ARGUMENT.

The psychical activities are divided into three classes: the intellectual, the emotional and the volitional. The transmission of these activities from spirit to spirit constitutes psychical interaction. These three classes of activities, however, are not so distinct as to become independent lines of interaction. The will and the feelings lie back of the intellect in such a way as to be reached only through it. If volitional and emotional interaction were possible between men, independent of the intellectual line, they would be dangerous rather than useful factors in the affairs of life. The whole question of psychical interaction, therefore, turns upon *intellectual* interaction.

With men, all intellectual activities on becoming interacts, pass through the body; egressive when the spirit is acting, and ingressive when the spirit is receiving action. We have no knowledge of intellectual inter-acts independent of the use of the body. The human spirit cannot go out of its own body to act upon another spirit, neither can it exert an ab-

stract influence thereon. The walls of the human body stand between the spirit within and all exterior spirits, unless it can be shown that two spirits may occupy the same house at the same time. Even admitting the presence of two spirits in one body at the same time, it does not follow that the things of each spirit become known to each other independent of a medium of communication?

To be more explicit, two disembodied spirits, natural or supernatural, cannot discern each the other's thoughts abstractly, by virtue of nearness, nor by virtue of contact. This, if true, would amount to a fusion of all knowledge, and the destruction of spirit identity, by resolving all spirits into one great mind, and thus end all intellectual progress. Two bodies of water, large or small, having contact, seek a level. A human spirit and God's spirit in contact, then, would raise the one and lower the other to a medium between the two, which proves, either that a human spirit never yet came in contact with the Divine spirit, or, that there is nothing in the "compact theory." Human spirits, then, whether in the body, or whether out of the body, cannot exchange ideas, nor discern each the other's thoughts, independent of a medium of communication. This law is fundamental to the personal continuity of each spirit, and to its eternal progress. A medium of communication between spirits is as essential to their intellectual interaction as are the spirits to act, or the activities to be transmitted. There may or may not be disembodied spirits; but there can be no disembodied thought, nor disembodied psychical influence.

That in which and by which thought is transmitted,

we call signs. The transmission and life of thought, therefore, depends upon the transmissibility and durability of the signs used. In this manner, thought is communicated from spirit to spirit, place to place, and age to age. Upon signs depend all our social, civil, commercial, fraternal and religious institutions. By signs we understand each other upon all the affairs, duties and relations of life. In short, the whole question of psychical, therefore spiritual, interaction depends upon the law of signs.

One of the characteristics of law wherever found, whether reference be had to an abstract physical force or to a rule of action, is uniformity. In physical science, law denotes a uniformly acting force; in moral science, a uniform rule or method of action. In nature, God is the agent, and law the instrument of his power; this is also true of God in the spiritual domain. With men, each spirit is an agent, and the body the instrument of its power; but, as the body is used to express the signs, without which it would be useless as a medium of interaction, the *signs* and not the body become the law of psychical interaction.

All signs are resolvable into groups, families and systems; spirits cannot interact by the use of unknown signs without an interpreter.

A few signs may be exchanged with domestic animals, but only within their instincts. But few mental comparisons exist between men and all lower forms of life; the contrasts are overwhelming. Animals have contributed no thought upon any of the civil, social and religious problems of life. Man is the lowest mental unit to which the moral nature attaches;

below man, the possibility for spiritual interaction is wanting, psychical influence. Animals cannot be elevated to the moral and spiritual ranks, while the human spirit knows no limit to progress; but, its possibilities for intellectual interaction are circumscribed by its knowledge of signs. However strong the will power of a mother, she cannot prevent her child from grasping the flame or the serpent by mere psychical influence. It may be safely said that there is no intellectual interaction between spirits outside of the use of signs.

The question of intellectual interaction with supernatural beings has been the problem of the ages. If it exists, and upon the intellectual basis it cannot be denied, it must be by the use of signs known to men. That supernatural beings have a law of interaction natural to their state, but supernatural to men, is the rational inference; but such a law would be of no use as a medium of spiritual interaction with men in the absence of an interpreter. The supernatural ranks of intellectual beings are departed human spirits, angels, and God. Let us examine the possibilities of inter-action with these in the order given.

The law of signs familiar to men is inoperative between the living and the dead; we are oblivious to any exchange of ideas by the use of any known signs between embodied and disembodied spirits. Departed human spirits have contributed no thought to us upon any of the social, political, civil, religious, or scientific problems of the age; they communicate no knowledge to us of things in the unseen world. The church is not vitalized by the energy of departed saints, nor are Christians nourished by the spirits of

the dead. If our thoughts, feelings, or volitions be in any degree influenced by disembodied human spirits, we are wholly unconscious of the fact. The doctrine known as "Modern Spiritualism" has never shown a fact for a basis, nor a practical use of their claims, and is not an elevating force in a Christian civilization. Materialization of the departed spirit is as fundamental to intellectual interaction with men, as is the medium of interaction; and the only authenticated instances of this kind are the cases of Samuel, Elijah and Moses.

Intellectual interaction between men and angels rests upon a broader historic basis. The presence of angels among men is as well authenticated as the presence of Christ. This enabled the angels to use the law of signs familiar to men, outside of which we are as effectually barred from their society as from the society of departed human spirits. If angels in any way affect our minds other than by the use of signs familiar to men, we are unconscious of the fact; they may be active in their ministrations "for them who shall be heirs of salvation" in a thousand ways imperceptible to us, but such activities are not interacts. We do not appeal to the angels for comfort, counsel nor guidance; spiritual nourishment does not emanate from their minds manward. Any law of interaction familiar to angels would be of no value to us, if other than our own, and the law of signs familiar to us, the angels can not use except as they are permitted to step out upon the human stage of action.

The Pharaohs have left us conceptions in the pyramids of Egypt; the Cæsars have given us ideas in the

ruins of an empire; ideals of Grecian minds, in chiseled marble, continue to excite the admiration of students, but in all that the centuries have handed down to us, there is not an embalmed idea upon which we can look and say that it was conceived by a human spirit after its departure, nor by an angel in heaven, outside of the messages communicated by God's permission; and then only as bearers of God's will and not their own conceptions.

Between men and God the premises are different; the intervening field of thought is incomprehensibly broad. All that God has made, significant as signs, may be classed under three heads: External Nature, Human Nature, and the Bible. In each of these books there may be supernatural signs, but the books, as such, come under or within the law of signs familiar to men. These three books correspond to the three faculties of the human spirit; the book of Nature reveals the wisdom of God; Human Nature the feelings of God, and the Bible the will of God. In the universe, we *see* God; in the spirit, we *feel* God, and in the Bible, we *hear* God. External nature and human nature are canonical books the world over; they were written by the finger of God, therefore inspired books; we still have the original copies.

With the Bible, however, there is a controversy; that it contains truth not found elsewhere is generally conceded, but how its authors came into possession of these specific facts is a question. The biblical writers attribute their information on things otherwise unknown and unknowable to three sources, to wit: the angels, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit; but could these agents have communicated ideas to these

writers other than by the law of signs familiar to men? That the angels and the Son of God depended upon the use of signs in the communication of their messages and ideas to men, is not questioned; that the Holy Spirit used the *same medium* in enlightening prophets and apostles is a matter of record; he "spake" to them, and "taught" them. The invisibility of the Holy Spirit as a teacher does not imply nor necessitate the use of invisible methods. The mental miracles recorded in the Bible are evidences of the supernatural character of the persons interacting with men and not of supernatural methods of interaction. There is a difference between revelation and inspiration, and it seems more consistent with conceded facts to depend inspiration upon revelation, than the reverse. The Holy Spirit evidently revealed truth to prophets and apostles, but upon the same basis and by the same methods used by the Son of God; he "*spake*" unto them; the truth revealed inspired their spirits. It is the truth presented in their writings that is precious to us, rather than their inspirations.

It will be proper at this point to compare the respective merits of the three books of revealed truth. Of the book of "Nature" Gregory says: "No profound and right-thinking man can fail to discover in God's universe a vast system of moral compensation and retribution; but it is evident that the will of God expressed therein is difficult of interpretation; that man in his present condition, and without light from other sources, can find only a dim record of God's moral attributes in the tendencies of the outer world; and that the moral law therein revealed is made visi-

ble only by a process of reasoning too complicated to be within the reach of the majority of mankind." The revelation of God's will in man's moral nature is likewise dim and difficult of interpretation. Its deficiency as a rule of action, unaided by a higher revelation, may be seen in the condition of nations left to their moral instincts. A sound and evenly balanced mind might, in the absence of moral disorder, maintain spiritual health, but the very presence of evil makes man's moral nature inadequate to the task of his elevation and welfare. The Bible is, therefore, our highest medium of spirituality; the one most prolific in spiritual ideas; in it we have the grandest description of God's attributes and majesty, and the clearest expression of his will. It also presents to the human mind the most powerful incentives to interact with God; the strongest possible motives to obedience. It is an unfathomable well of comfort, and literally exhausts the persuasive forces. As God does not compel the service of men, it follows that there is no stronger force exerted upon the human spirit for its salvation, *than in the presentation of truth*. It is in this sense that the Gospel is called the "power of God unto salvation" to the believer.

But spiritual interaction is not limited to the three revelations named; at least four other lines are known and used: these are the "Providences" of God, the "Ordinances" of God, "Prayer" and "Praise." We have no stronger proof of God's existence and interactive relations with men, than in the things which each day provides. A man's millions avail him nothing if God open not his hand in blessings. By the daily temporal and spiritual blessings received,

God's love and care become manifest, and that not without its fruit in the human spirit.

Of the maze of religious ordinances in the world, but three bear the impress of God's authority; these are Baptism, the Emblematic Supper, and Sacrifice. It may be objected that it is a mistake to call the ordinances named a medium of spiritual interaction. In the absence of the mental dispositions which they manifest, this objection would have force; for, in the absence of spiritual energy, the ordinances are useless. The mental disposition especially expressed by these ordinances is submission. Unexpressed submission to the will of God is not interaction, and as we can not divorce interactive forces from interactive methods, it follows that Christianity can not dispense with ordinances. Some, apparently, would like to substitute the historic ordinances with modern, or new ones. The religious world may not rest until the experiment is tried, but it promises nothing. Attempts already made in this direction support this view. The ordinances named are as expressive of submission to the will of God, as are the Universe, Human Nature and the Bible expressive of truth; being divinely instituted, and congenial to man's state the world over, the religious world can spend its time and talents in a better cause than quarreling over their continuity in the church.

Prayer is so universally conceded to be a method of spiritual interaction, that but little need be said thereon, here, and now. It has been well said that "prayer is the sublimest act a human being can perform." It gives expression to man's highest nature and noblest life, and is a most important means for

lifting the soul into conformity with the Divine will. While the world stands, prayer will remain a medium of hope for the troubled heart. The objection that prayers can not be answered has been met by argument in all ages of the world; but all the objections of the infidel world can not remove that intuition within the human soul to pray, nor the Christian's faith in prayer. Not a structure in the universe of God, nor a hope in the breast of man rests upon a surer basis than prayer; it is one of God's instrumentalities for working in man a larger appreciation of His interactive relations with Him.

Praise is a distinct and distinguished spiritual force; also, an interactive line between men and God. Probably by no other method are we more conscious of God's responsiveness than when under the influence of praise. Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs are to a joyful heart as the ordinances to a submissive will—the outlet of the spirit's energy into the great channel of interaction with God.

Of all the spiritual forces thus far known, truth and love are projected from God, manward, through External nature, the Human constitution and the Bible, as mediums; the evidence of the reception of these forces in the human mind appear in the mental dispositions known as love, hope, fear and submission. These dispositions are publicly expressed by conformity to the ordinances ordained therefor. The lines of spiritual force projected from the human spirit Godward, are love and praise; and the evidence of their reception in the mind of God appears in His blessings and the providences enjoyed in daily life.

Such, then, is the law of spiritual interaction and its inter-operative nature. True, it has not all of the characteristics common to civil statutes and the physical forces, yet it is none the less a uniform system of spiritual energy. Every religious movement is liable to encounter the dangers of legalism on the one hand, or of confusion on the other; we have the legalism in Romanism, the confusion in Protestantism, and while the legalism of the one has wrought incalculable injury to the world, the Bible knows nothing of the conditionless salvation, lawless religion, and disorderly church of the other.

In what is known as the orthodox theory of spiritual reconstruction, the law of spiritual interaction is not a factor; not even a possibility. With it regeneration begins and ends in the sovereign acts of God. The theory is, that the automatic activities of the human spirit are evil, and that it can not think a good thought unless ejected by Divine pressure. That there is a mental deficiency on account of sin is evident, but not the totality of sin. This deficiency, or the margin, seen in practical life, between the scientifically sound mind and the one of daily life, is God's apology for interfering in human affairs, and which furnished the occasion for Christ's Spiritual Kingdom; but the centuries have taught us that God works by laws in the spiritual as well as in the physical domain.

By the use of the law of signs, God has put Himself in communication with man, and thereby furnished us with our highest ideals of life, our strongest motives to holiness, our sweetest comforts, and our expectations. Experience has demonstrated the congeniality of this law to all human states, and its use has given

to the world its highest types of life, purest homes and its best civilization. Wherever this law has been operative, light has dawned, society has been elevated, and civilization advanced. Under its benign influence we have the strongest virtues and the most aggressive Christianity. It affords ample basis for a united church, for the mission spirit, and for all the arts and sciences. It has surpassed all other systems in energizing the human heart in all that is good; it complements every spiritual want. It is the highway to eternal progress, the unfolding splendor of the ages to come.

The sights and sounds supposed by many to accompany conversion are neither uniform nor significant. In them there is an endless confusion of agents and agencies, causes and effects, forces and results, means and ends, efforts and helplessness. Such pretensions are unworthy of an enlightened Christianity.

As dreams are supposed to be a means by which God communicates information to men, we must submit a few thoughts on this subject. Dreams are but the automatic activities of that restless, sleepless spirit. Dreams and historic events were frequently coincident, but such dreams had no significance until after the event. We do not rely upon dreams for business plans, and if not in secular matters, much less can we in the spiritual. The world is tired of dreamy churches and dreaming Christians. It is commonly believed that God, in olden times, made use of dreams to enlighten, direct and warn his servants. We must distinguish between dreams and realities. That many incidents in the lives of the apostles and prophets passed before their minds in dreams, before

they became realities, is historic; but, as stated, the event signalized the dream and not the dream the event. Peter's vision on the housetop signified nothing to him until after the conversion of Cornelius. There is a class of dreams and visions frequently mentioned in the Bible that seem to have been historic realities and not automatic mental creations; such as Paul's experience on the day of his conversion. This, and similar experiences afterwards in his own life, and in the lives of others, were actual appearances, and by them messages were communicated from the supernatural to the natural mind. But the use of such supernatural experiences was local, and any attempt to use such elements as factors in the conversion of sinners and development of the church to-day can result only in disappointment, shame and disaster. Such experiences are not available as methods of spiritual interaction. Supernatural signs and miracles, unaccompanied by intellectual messages, can have no significance; but when accompanied with information they attest the *supernatural character of the agent* interacting, and not the supernaturalness of inter-methods. The burning bush was supernatural, but the voice natural. The great light witnessed by Saul of Tarsus was supernatural, the voice which enlightened him natural. The words heard in either case were not the pricks of a prompting conscience, but conversations between living persons. The still, small voice of which so much is said, is but the human spirit interacting with itself.

God is supposed to know the unexpressed thoughts in the human spirit. Admitting this to be a fact does not affect this argument, pro or con, because

such knowledge is not interactive; such knowledge may have its reflex influence on the Divine mind, but none upon the human, as there is no transmission of ideas to the human spirit. Christ's foreknowledge of the conduct of Judas Iscariot, Caiaphas and Pilate did not in the least affect their minds. The question before us is not what any spirit, natural or supernatural, may know, but how it may interact in knowledge, or transmit and discern transmitted ideas. Our position is that without the use of the law of signs, there can be no intellectual interaction, "for who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him."

The difficult point in the theory of man's spiritual reconstruction by the law of signs alone, grows out of the supposition that sin has so impaired the human will that while some have clear perceptions of duty, and feel the force of all incentives thereto, they yet lack the power to enforce action; and hence, the conclusion that God must impart strength abstractly. There are phenomenal cases of reformation, but these are not sufficient to warrant the existence of a theory so at variance with reason, experience, and the known law therefor. If God did not raise the will power of every creature to the same degree by a sovereign act, we could not resist the conclusion that He was unjust and partial in the distribution of the greatest of all blessings. But we believe that God is just; besides, if He were to increase the *will power* of a man independent of the law of the mind, it would but increase his danger and accelerate his tendency toward evil. The law of spiritual interaction is of necessity modified by the

material and psycho-material laws. Truth on this account is revealed to the human mind in proportion to the relative force of these laws, and not as measured out by the will of God; God's will is "that all should come to a knowledge of the truth."

Two specific benefits are conferred upon the human spirit by the truth; first, it makes free from sin; second, it opens the way to eternal progress. Freedom from sin and a strong affinity or love for the truth are the highest conceptions of spiritual attainments; it is more consistent, therefore, to say that the Holy Spirit works upon the human spirit with truth, than through it. Truth is the thing transmitted to the mind, and not a channel through which something else passes; the mind enlarges by grasping transmitted or revealed truth. The truth is the divine nature of God of which the spirit partakes, and by which it is transformed into the mind of Christ. If the truth be not in the mind, neither God nor Christ can be there. "The Comforter which is the spirit of truth," permeates and renews "the inner man day by day." The human spirit may interact with God in many ways intuitively, but of spiritual interaction it must have a consciousness, because it involves faith—not faith in dogmas, traditions and doctrines, but in God. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is." All that God has made and done may be built into the basis of our faith. If nature be studied merely as a terminal of research and thought, it is not then an interactive medium; but the mind which through nature sees God beyond, is thereby enabled to commune with Him. All that God has made and done visible to the human mind

is intermediate between God and man, and a medium through which God reveals himself to man, and by which he elevates man toward Himself in all that is moral and spiritual.

In conclusion, we must note the fact that efforts have been, and are continually being made, to discover some media by which spirits may communicate independent of the use of the law of intervening signs, and while many singular phenomena have been noted, nothing in the nature of a commercial fact in that direction has been discovered. Let us not forget that explorations and deep sea soundings are continually being made in the interest of physical science, pending which, the vessels of commerce are crossing and recrossing the ocean, according to known natural and mechanical laws. Likewise, the welfare of the race demands that we vigorously utilize the known psychical and spiritual laws of interaction, independent of the efforts made from time to time to grasp the unknown. The destiny of the millions of souls will not permit a suspension of spiritual commerce with God for a single day. The human spirit, God-given, endless in its duration, endowed with an ever-increasing desire for knowledge, and susceptible of endless development, is dependent for its attainments upon interactive relations sustained with higher and purer spiritual beings, especially with God, which relations can only be established and utilized, so far as we yet know, upon the law of signs. Spiritual commerce with God is the climax of living and important issues, and when asked for a certified copy of returns from the Divine mind, we can point with pride to the inexhaustible fields of thought in the universe, to the

unparalleled life of Christ, to the spirituality of the Bible (always just in advance of the morals of the succeeding generations), and to their true results upon the human spirit, upon society, and in the world's history. Spiritual interaction with God through known media has lived on and on through all the storms upon the restless ocean of time, and the man to-day who builds upon this *law*, builds upon the "rock of ages."

THE SUPERNATURAL AS THE GROUND OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

I. B. GRUBBS.

My speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.—*Paul.*

The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.—*John.*

The works which the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do, bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me.—*Jesus.*

Let us suppose that a witness before a court, when required to testify from personal observation, should propose to give as evidence a geometrical demonstration of the alleged matter of fact under judicial investigation. How long would the so-called witness be permitted to remain in court? Suppose, in addition, that this mathematical genius should deny the historical reality, or at least, the possibility of knowing the historic verity, of what can not be tested by his demonstrative methods. The judge and attorneys would not be slow in pronouncing the crank a fit subject for the lunatic asylum. Reverse the case. Suppose a professor of mathematics should require a student to

take his place at the blackboard and prove that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, and that the student should propose to establish the truth of the proposition with more ease by the testimony of his fellow-students, and deny the truthfulness of the proposition, or, at least, the possibility of proving it to be true unless susceptible of proof in the way which his wisdom had indicated. The same conclusion as to the proper place for such a person would be drawn in this case as in the other.

Well, just such a lunatic is that devotee of Modern Science, who denies the reality of all that cannot be subjected to scientific methods, or who proclaims himself an agnostic as to the truthfulness of such. We have no quarrel with science or with scientific men who are modest enough to attend to their own business and who, while rendering to science the things that are science's, are equally ready to render to faith the things that are faith's and who, with sound sense can recognize the certainty of the latter as equal to that of the former, though established on different grounds and under the application of very different methods. Truly the infinite realm for the ceaseless push of scientific investigation is sufficiently ample to gratify the most enthusiastic lover of discoveries in this enticing domain. Let all rejoice in the wondrous faculty with which God has endowed the human soul for intellectual dominion over the works of his hands in comprehending the laws that interpret his will in the government of the universe. The possibilities in this direction are not even yet conceivable, and the rich stores of scientific truth already attained are but

the mere prophecy of man's greatest heritage to come.

And yet if there is a God as well as a world in which we may behold his reflected glory, he is surely able to communicate to human intelligence still other and higher truth than that which may be learned by man's unaided research in the investigation of the universe. And suppose that in the progress of universal history, there have come through rifted clouds in the sky of human experience certain gleams of this higher sunlight, would not this experience attest the presence of the supernatural? And if the intelligence could at the same time discover the moral necessity of such visitations, would not this of itself evince the unreasonableness of all opposition to their probability, to say nothing of their possibility? The supernatural is possible, because God is greater than nature. It is probable because, in God's esteem, man also is greater than nature. It is actual in human history because God seeks to bring man into fellowship with himself, and it is known thus to be actual as having attested its presence. "The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and declare unto you that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us." The rejection of this as unreal or unknowable on the mere ground that it cannot be subjected to the test of scientific methods has already been shown to be absurd.

We speak here of the supernatural in the form of the miraculous. No miracles are called for in special providential agency, which, indeed, is such a union of the natural with the supernatural as to exclude the miraculous. Let us illustrate. By special act of my

will, not as the mere result of organization, my hand describes a curve. It is not a miracle, for it takes place in strict harmony with the laws of my organism. Yet it is not merely mechanical, since it flows immediately from a special fiat of the will, and thus differs from the circulation of the blood or the continuous contraction and expansion of the lungs as the mere result of the organic constitution. Now, many, including the materialistic scientist, regard the government of the universe as simply mechanical, not only perceiving the uniformity of the laws of nature, but failing to recognize the fact, or to acknowledge the need, of any agency above and beyond these. Why could not the divine will, by special command without miracle, set in motion the forces of nature as occasion may demand, with infinitely more ease than my will can order, with the certainty of obedience, the movements of my hand? We would have here, indeed, the supernatural, but not the miraculous. It is thus that I distinguish special providential interposition as one form of the supernatural from the miraculous as the other—the miraculous being, in the view here taken, the production of results by a special act of the divine will, without the use of natural means.

And now as miracles were never needed and have never been employed in the providential government of the world, still less may we suppose that a single one was ever wrought to confer any mere temporal advantage. The "faith-cure" business amounts to a degradation of the supernatural. Neither Christ himself nor any apostle ever invoked this high agency to confer on any man simply the enjoyment of health, or wealth, or power, or worldly benefit of any kind.

Temporal comforts were always the incident and never the end of the manifestation of supernatural power. After the miraculous feeding of the five thousand on a few loaves and fishes, the people came flocking to Jesus, as though they would be thus fed again. Let all believers in the "faith-cure" give heed to the rebuke administered by him. "You seek me, not because you did witness the miracle, but because you did eat of the loaves and were filled. Labor not for the meat that perishes, but for that meat which endures unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you, for him hath God the Father sealed." Yes, they utterly failed to discern the true object of the miracle, or to recognize the principle on which it was performed. This principle was indicated by the Savior himself when he said: "The works that the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me."

Ought any one, then, who is endowed with the faculty of common sense, to wonder that miracles are found in the Bible, that the supernatural was a necessary function of him who was more wonderful than all the wonders of his marvelous life, a greater miracle than the sum total of all the miracles he ever wrought? When a student in perplexity came to me with his difficulties as to the supernatural conception and birth of the Lord Jesus, my simple reply was in these words: If you do not stand in need of a supernatural Christ, miraculous in birth, in life, in victory over death, in ascension to glory everlasting for you and for me, pray tell me what kind of a Christ will meet your wants and satisfy the yearnings of your

soul? What kind of a Christ would you or I make in view of the spiritual poverty, the deep, dark woes, the measureless ruin of our race? The insane effort to divest the Messiah of his supernatural character, and to eliminate from the Bible its miraculous phenomena, is like trying to disrobe the sun of his mantle of light. The Bible cannot be a Bible unless it is founded in the supernatural; and Christ would be no Christ for us apart from his miraculous powers.

And the very reason for the acceptance of the Biblical miracles is likewise the true reason for the rejection of all other alleged miraculous manifestations. God is a good economist as to the expenditure of divine energy. He neither does, nor authorizes to be done, anything whatever for which there exists not an imperative necessity. Even the heathen poet, Horace, felt the incongruity of divine intervention, except when a knot was presented which none but a god could untie, a difficulty emerged that demanded a divine solution. Miracles have not been scattered broadcast over the surface of human history for the mere amusement or entertainment of prurient lovers of the marvelous. In the position assigned them by the Scriptures, there is a divine fitness and propriety. Apart from this they have no sufficient justification and answer no reasonable end. There is no room, therefore, for a comparison of the supernatural events of the Bible with the senseless legends of the medieval ages. And apart from the honest disclaimer of Boniface, the so-called "apostle of Germany," and of Ansgar, the equally efficient missionary of Scandinavia, to the possession of any supernatural functions, we may conclude on he basis of inflexible principles, that the pretensions

of others in those times to miraculous powers are utterly unworthy of a serious consideration.

But let us come closer to the point immediately before us—the true ground for a rightful vindication of the supernatural as indicated in the Holy Scriptures. This appears, as already suggested, in the moral necessity for the miraculous element of the Christian religion. Let us instance, as affording ample illustration of this principle, the most stupendous fact of all human history—the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Let us suppose that some friend of honesty and good sense, should report to us as a fact, that he had seen and conversed with one who was known by all to have died some days before. We should feel that we were not justified in accepting his testimony. And suppose, further, that others of equal veracity and intelligence should confirm the report. We would simply be confounded without being convinced. Why? Because we could recognize no imperative demand for such an event and see no fitting relation that it could sustain to the interests of humanity or the all-controlling purpose of Him who guides the course of human history and determines the destiny of nations and empires. But let us, on the other hand, suppose that we not only recognized a necessary relation between the alleged event and the universal needs of the race, and the far-reaching plans and purposes of God, but that we also discerned with the utmost clearness abundant foreshadowings and predictions of it in the past history of mankind, what then? We should be very unreasonable were we to reject the testimony that equalled only a half of that which we have supposed.

And now with these important considerations influencing our thought, let us approach the greatest event of universal history, the resurrection of Jesus the Messiah from the grave. Had there been no necessity for this tremendous fact of most important consequences we may be certain that it would have found no place in the history of this world. But in this great event the conception of Paul finds ample elucidation. "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most pitiable. But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first fruits of those who slept. For since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here is the consummation of those works which the Father gave to his Son for execution, to which our attention is directed by the Son himself as evidence of the fact that the Father had sent him. Only Jesus could meet the demands of our race and bear the interests of humanity upon his mighty shoulders. And but for the fulfillment of his great mission, the failure of mankind must have been complete. Yes, "if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain; you are yet in your sins."

And as we thus see the moral demand for the resurrection of Christ, in which is centered his whole supernatural career, we may also note its connection with prophetic declarations, and these two elements combine to remove all antecedent improbability as touching the supernatural in the life of our Savior. Hence,

the apostle Paul most wisely associates the miraculous fact of Christ's resurrection with the miraculous predictions of that great event. "I delivered unto you," says he, "that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." As thus connected with the divine counsels through prophetic announcements, and taking place to meet a great spiritual demand, this marvelous event in human history requires no more than ordinary reliable evidence to attest its reality. The testimony, however, by which it is sustained is of the amplest character, and fully satisfies every requirement of intelligent and reasonable belief. For the risen Christ challenged the scrutiny of a plurality of the senses of a plurality of witnesses on a plurality of occasions. "That which was from the beginning," says John, "which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life, declare we unto you." And doubting Thomas was not alone as to the demand made in the expression: "Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." And this was exactly right; and so the Savior completely met the demand. Thomas and the rest properly doubted that we might wisely believe when on the dissipation of all their doubts they were ready to submit such testimony as would defy all unbelief. Persons addicted to blind credulity, or readily given to self-deception, would not have answered as suitable witnesses for the propagation of the testimony on which the faith of a world

in all ages must securely repose. For this important purpose Jesus would select men of broad common sense and scrutinizing intelligence who, in the proper use of their faculties, could be so well persuaded of the truth of their own message as to undergo martyrdom in its behalf. Being themselves certain that they were not mistaken as to the facts submitted to a plurality of their senses on a plurality of occasions, and giving unanswerable proof of their trustworthiness as witnesses in saying, "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" their message comes to us with the divine power of all-conquering and irresistible truth.

In this connection it might be well to state parenthetically, that the main elements of the argument from original testimony, as now presented, have come to us in an apostolic document over the genuineness of which the so-called "higher criticism" has not as yet breathed the spirit of captious skepticism. The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with its fifteenth chapter of priceless value, stands among the few sacred books that remain unassailed by the destructive critics. No importance, however, is here attached to this consideration, for the truth of God which "endureth forever" is neither dependent on the favor nor endangered by the hostility of rationalistic fault-finders. Those who feel that their faith does not "stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God," are not apt to be greatly influenced by the arbitrary methods, the false assumptions, and the inconclusive reasonings of dogmatic doubters and disputants.

But, returning to the thread of the present discussion, we proceed to consider another feature or form

of the supernatural as a ground of religious belief. We have quoted Paul's assertion that Jesus "was raised the third day according to the Scriptures." He thus unites the supernatural in prophecy with the supernatural in fact. And so did Jesus himself when pointing to the grounds on which he was willing to rest his divine claims. He not only said: "The works that the Father hath given me to accomplish, the very works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me," but he added in the same connection, "Search the Scriptures; for in them you think you have eternal life, and these are they which testify of me." Consider, my brethren, the immense weight, the overpowering force of this divine argument of our Lord; and if he himself could risk his cause on the strength of this foundation, then you and I may safely build thereon our hope and faith in him. Let a simple illustration precede a full statement of the case at this point in the argument. Were you to find any where a most accurate delineation of a friend's features in some artistic drawing or painting, it would be difficult to dissuade you from the conclusion that the face of that friend had stood before the eye of the artist. And suppose that face to be unique, containing many peculiar elements of feature and expression, and thus broadly distinguished from all others. One could no more move you from your conviction as to the truth of the conclusion just stated than he could shake the foundations of the everlasting hills.

Now it is certitude of this sort that God would kindly as well as wisely afford to those who should seek among the generations of men to identify him whose "name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor,

The mighty God, the Father of the everlasting age, the Prince of Peace;" and who should be exalted "upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." Under divine manipulation, prophetic fingers have traced in a moral image the marvelous lineaments of a Great Original, and thrown the portraiture upon the canvas of the ages as God's own unanswerable argument for all time in fixing the identity of his Son, the promised Messiah, for the redemption and salvation of the children of men. And so overwhelming was the complete moral resemblance, that when the devout Ethiopian nobleman, who had long been familiar with the prophetic image, saw for the first time, under the guidance of Philip, the divine Original, his soul was kindled with a rapturous desire to rush into the arms of the blessed Christ; and, on confessing his steadfast faith and being baptized into union with him, he "went on his way rejoicing." He not only saw that no other had met, but was fully convinced that no other could meet, the inspired description in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

In saying that the prophetic description just referred to had long been familiar to devout worshipers when the apostles and primitive evangelists were going forth under the great commission of their Lord to Christianize the world, we state what is both demonstrably true and what has great logical force in the present argument. If, at the time that the New Testament order of things was inaugurated, there was in existence, and had been for ages, an Old Testament outline of these things, and especially an accurate

portraiture of the great Founder of the new economy, then the expression "inspired description," as employed above, is amply justified as the only suitable representation of the matter. And critics may either imagine or truly discover a "Deutero-Isaiah" for much of the wonderful production to which Isaiah's name is attached, but the argument in hand remains absolutely unaffected by the result. If the prophetic delineation antedates the reality delineated, it matters not by what instrumentality the process was conducted: it is the all-knowing intelligence, and that alone that could be the source of the marvelously accurate antecedent representation. And how could the apostles have carried conviction to the minds of unbelieving Jews by pretended predictions which their hearers would certainly know were utterly unknown to their sacred writings? The very effort to establish the Christian faith in this way would have been crushed in its incipiency, and those who made the attempt would have rendered themselves ridiculous in the eyes of their countrymen. But when they stood forth, armed on the one hand with well-known prophetic descriptions which they were prepared to show could truthfully apply to no other than Jesus the Nazarene, and, on the other hand, as witnesses ready to suffer in behalf of what they themselves had seen and heard and their "hands had handled of the Word of life," we are not to wonder that in one day three thousand believers in the Old Testament, but unbelievers till then in the claims of Jesus, should fall under the profoundest conviction. The marvelous correspondence between the prophetic image and the divine reality

stood before their mental gaze and overwhelmed their souls.

And this, my brethren, is God's argument to-day, and the one on which his Son relies for the conquest of the world. And the more it is looked into and thoughtfully considered, the more clearly is manifest its unanswerable force. Human learning can, indeed, only erect a logical structure that will be able to stand till superior learning and talent shall scatter it to the four winds. Hence, it is not well that the faith of any one should "stand in the wisdom of men." Let the pillars which God alone has erected for the temple of faith and worship remain as the only immovable foundation of religion. Science, philosophy, learning, are good enough in their place, but they can never be substituted for the divine basis on which alone the spiritual hopes of humanity can be permanently established. And without this supernatural ground of religious belief, we may justifiably repeat the apostle's conclusion: "Then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."

But one more phase or feature of the supernatural, as the ground of our faith and hope, remains for final consideration. How are we to avail ourselves of the testimony of apostles and prophets except on conditions by which we can be thoroughly satisfied as to the correctness of their statements in the enunciation of that testimony? What guarantee have we that mistakes did not mingle themselves with their utterances of fact or truth in the promulgation of their message of life by voice and pen? The prophetic delineations of the Old Testament have already been represented as "inspired descriptions," and justifica-

tion for this manner of expression claimed on the ground of exact correspondence between prediction and fulfillment. A resort to details in confirmation would be easy enough, but it is not deemed essential to the general purpose of the recent discussion. We come at once to the consideration of the vital principles involved in our argument. It is the question of the divinely promised inspiration of the apostles in advocating the claims of Jesus that now demands a most earnest, patient, and thoughtful investigation. My brethren, follow me, I beseech you, with the scrutiny of logical insight, and let us in grappling with this great theme see if we can not together reach a resting-place where the mind may repose with that satisfaction which it, as we believe, has a right to demand in matters connected with our faith and hope.

I have said that inspiration was divinely promised to the apostles to support them in setting forth and upholding the claims of the Messiah. "These things," said Jesus, "have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." "I have yet many things to say unto you, but you can not bear them now. Howbeit, when the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." Now before we advance to the consideration of the apostolic interpretation of these promises, an interpretation evolved from apostolic

experience under the guidance of the Spirit as thus promised, let us be permitted to remark that if any one can reconcile these words of the infallible Christ with the possibility of erroneous teaching on the part of his apostles, he is endowed with a faculty for exegesis which is not possessed by men of ordinary capacity. The divine promise secured to them not only the guidance ot the understanding "into all truth" for accurate instruction in "all things" to be revealed, but even the quickening of the memory as to things previously heard from the lips of the great Teacher himself. Whatever faculty, therefore, needed to be touched by the inspiring Spirit to preclude the intrusion of error, was thus to be supported according to the Savior's own conception of the aid which he would extend to the apostles in their ministry of the Word of life. It was neither necessary, nor a matter of promise, that they were to be fortified against the influence of error in any other respect than in their capacity as teachers of the Christian religion, as men authorized to speak in the name of the great "Author and Finisher of the faith." Paul might not be able to remember the number of persons he had baptized on a given occasion, and nothing would depend on the result. But if the Holy Spirit failed to "call to remembrance all things whatsoever" Jesus had said to his apostles in preparing them for the moral and spiritual renovation of the world, the necessary consequence would have been a serious vitiation of their religious teaching, and this, too, through a manifest failure of the promised spiritual support from the mouth of the Lord Jesus himself.

But we are now ready to consider the conception

entertained by the apostles of their own inspiration, and consequently their understanding of the Savior's promise of this power to them. Of course we make no difference between Paul and the rest, though he was not of the original twelve. Let us hear what he has to say on the topic in hand: "It is written, things which eye saw not and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man—whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him, but unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searches all things, yea, the depths of God. For who among men knows the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knows save the Spirit of God. But we received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in words taught of man's wisdom, but taught of the Holy Spirit, combining spiritual things with spiritual." This most significant passage sets forth Paul's conception of his own inspiration and that of his fellow apostles. Two things are clearly stated as matter of fact: First, the Spirit revealed to the apostles the otherwise unknowable thoughts of God; and second, it communicated these thoughts or spiritual things, "not in words taught of man's wisdom, but in those taught of the Spirit" himself. Now in the realm of fact there is no room whatever for theory. If we accept as true the teaching of the apostle we must believe without hesitation that inspiration reaches in some way the expression as well as the thought expressed by the original teachers of the Christian religion. As to how it does this there is

room for difference of theory in perfect unity of faith; but to deny the fact itself so clearly stated by the apostle is to fall thus far under the dominion of unbelief.

Nor did the fact that inspiration influenced the expression make the communication of divine ideas a mere mechanical process, or convert the apostles into mere amanuenses of the Holy Spirit. If every word employed by an apostle was simply dropped, as it were, into his mind, we could not account for the differences of individuality so clearly discernible in the writings of different authors as manifest in diversity of style and varying modes of expression. All that was needful to effect the important end in view was the exercise of such control over the manner of communication as to prevent the employment of unsuitable terms and confinement to such forms of expression as were adapted to the nature of the truth to be made known. The context of the passage above quoted shows that the apostle considered the philosophic technicalities and rhetorical diction of the Greeks unsuited to a correct presentation of spiritual things, and hence he says that he came not among them "with excellency of speech or of wisdom declaring the testimony of God." This, as he avers, would have deprived the cross of Christ of its real power and laid the foundation for their faith, not in "the power of God," but in "the wisdom of men." It is to this, therefore, that he refers in saying that he expressed the things of the Spirit "not in words taught of man's wisdom, but in those taught of the Holy Spirit." Let the thoughts expressed be themselves of divine origin and let the expression be so

regulated as not to obscure or misrepresent the truth in its passage to the minds of men, and we have infallibility on the part of the apostles as teachers of religion. If, in their capacity as our religious guides, they possessed not this supernatural endowment, and there was room anywhere in their teaching for the intrusion of error, then the legal maxim, "*Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus*" will apply here also in all its force, and our religious faith will melt away into absolute nothingness.

With these convictions we deem it important to offer in conclusion our vindication both of Paul's logic and his inspiration in a celebrated passage which has long been pronounced fallacious by German critics of the rationalistic type. Reference is here made to the apostle's argument in Gal. 3: 16: "Now to Abraham were the promises spoken, and to his seed. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one; And to thy seed which is Christ." Now, says the objector, Paul is here betrayed into a mistake as to the use of the term "seed," and on this mistake proceeds to build an argument that is necessarily sophistical. His aim is to show that the promise referred to does not apply to the Jews in general as descendants of Abraham, but to the one descendant, the Messiah. To do this he argues that the promise does not concern "seeds as of many," but only "seed," as indicative of one. But, continues the objector, the noun "seed" is collective, and denotes plurality without assuming the grammatical form of the plural number. Hence, as it appears in the promise, it may refer to the Jews as many, and not to Christ, as one. Thus the well-known usage of the term, it is said, is in

direct conflict with Paul's conclusion as to the import of the promise.

This arraignment appears very plausible, and would be very logical but for the fact that it is based on a complete misapprehension of the apostle's argument. That Paul was not ignorant of the fact that the term "seed," even in the singular number, denotes plurality of persons is evident in that he himself so employs the word in the twenty-ninth verse, and that, too, in commenting on the term as it occurs in the promise in hand. Hear him: "If you be Christ's, then are you Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Close attention to this ought to have taught the modern rationalistic opponents of the apostle that he had not in his mind any distinction of personal unity and plurality whatever. He had not the remotest conception that the term "seed," as occurring in the promise, applies to one individual as opposed to many, or excludes many individuals as opposed to one. And yet the false supposition that he so thinks is the sole ground on which the sage reasoners above referred to bring their damaging charge against an inspired apostle of Jesus Christ.

What then is the contrast of unity and plurality before the apostle's mind? Hear him once more in explanation of the promise on which he is commenting: "You are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Now it is on the very ground of this spiritual unity of believers "in Christ" that he

goes right on to say in the next verse, as already quoted, that they are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." When, therefore, he had before said that the "seed" of the promise refers to Christ as "one" in contrast with "seeds," as "of many," he speaks of Christ, not as one person in opposition to many persons, but of Christ as combining in spiritual unity in himself all believers as one kind of seed as distinguished from unbelieving Jews as another kind of Abraham's posterity which are not contemplated by the promise. The thought is brought out with still greater fullness in the further prosecution of his argument, when in the next chapter he says that "Abraham had two sons, one by the handmaid and one by the freewoman." These he describes as representative of two different kinds of posterity, two "seeds" in the proper pluralization of the term on which Paul's argument turns. He then quotes the expression: "Cast out the handmaid and her son; for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman." The apostle seeks to correct the fearful mistake of the Jews in supposing that because they were the natural descendants of Abraham they were "heirs" to the blessings contemplated in the promise on which he is commenting. His argument, predicated on the terms of the promise, would sweep away this false hope with overwhelming logical force and show them that the one only way to heirship under the promise is to enter into union with Christ as embracing in spiritual unity the only kind of Abrahamic posterity entitled to the inheritance divinely promised. By propriety of usage we speak of a sower of seed and a dealer in seeds, using the collective noun

in the former case in the singular to denote plurality of individual grains, and in the latter case, using the same term in the plural to denote plurality of kinds. Could the Jew make good his claim, then more than one kind of Abrahamic seed would be heirs under the promise—"the son of the handmaid," in the allegorical antitype, would inherit with the "son ofthe free-woman." The "seed" of the promise would be distributed into "seeds," and he who is "born after the flesh" would stand on a par with him who is "born after the Spirit" in direct conflict with the spiritual oneness of all in Christ Jesus. This being impossible, the Jewish claim stands refuted and Paul's inspired argument remains logical and unanswerable.

THE TERM "SEED" IN THE PROMISE TO ABRAHAM.

BY G. W. LONGAN.

A PREFATORY NOTE.

I find myself compelled to begin with a word of explanation. The first part of my present paper was written in the early autumn of 1890, and not for this Lectureship, but, provisionally, for the columns of the *Christian-Evangelist*. It is a reply to so much of Brother I. B. Grubbs' paper, read before the Lectureship of that year, as related to the above-mentioned subject. It was then confidently expected by me that Brother Grubbs' paper would appear in a Lectureship book before the end of the year. The book, however, was not published, and the printing of my reply was thus postponed indefinitely.

What I now wish to say may be put into very few words. I do not think that reviews, or formal replies, are in good taste in the work of our Lectureship. I have always thought this, and do not now see any reason to change my opinion. Accordingly, if the first part of the paper which I am about to read had been written primarily for the Lectureship, it would have taken the form of an independent essay, with very little reference to Brother Grubbs' able treatment of the matter in question. I regret that it is not now in that form. But when Bro. Lord asked me to prepare a

paper for this occasion, on this particular subject, the condition of my health was such that I thought it best for me to use the material in the form in which it had already been cast, thus saving both the labor and worry of a reconstruction. This, therefore, has been done, albeit, as I have hinted, with some misgiving as to the propriety of doing so. Had I been only a few years younger, or my health only a little better, I should not have hesitated a moment to adopt the course which accords best with my sense of propriety in such cases, regardless of any labor which would thereby have been imposed upon me. So I read to you to-day a response to Brother Grubbs, not because it is just the thing I like to do, but because, in justice to myself, I could not, as I supposed, do otherwise. As regards the spirit and methods of my reply, I hope that neither Brother Grubbs nor the Lectureship will find just cause of complaint. In the absence of such cause, I am persuaded that complaint will not be made. I have added a supplement to my reply as originally prepared, which I would fain hope may be regarded as a fairly valuable part of such contribution as I am able to make to the interest of the present occasion. But without further detaining you, I offer the whole paper in its present form for the unbiased consideration of the Lectureship.

GALLATIANS 3: 16 AGAIN.

In July, 1889, at Kirksville, Mo., I ventured to raise a question as to the logical soundness of Paul's use of the term "seed" in the above-cited passage of Scripture. There was immediately set up a great outcry by certain parties whose zeal, as I think, outran their

knowledge, but of that I do not here make any complaint. Truth has always had to make its way in spite of unreasoning opposition, nor does it seem likely that it will soon fare otherwise.

But in July, 1890, Prof. Grubbs, of Lexington, Ky., having been brought to the front, gave us in very terse, pointed terms, what he thought concerning this rash challenge of one of the fundamental assumptions of traditional orthodoxy. In his paper the question came up incidentally, as involved in a larger theme, but the reference to my mention of the matter the year before was plain enough. We are debtors to Bro. Grubbs for the frank, vigorous utterance of his convictions regarding the issue which had thus been suggested. Honest, manly discussion always does good in the end. I feel constrained to say, however, that the mooted point seems still to be as far as ever from settlement. And yet I wish to be modest, and to express this opinion with due deference to Bro. Grubbs, and to every other candid student of Scripture that shares his view. Not till we get to heaven will the mists be wholly cleared away, so that we shall no longer know in part, but fully, even as we are known.

The question in debate is easily stated. Is Paul's use of the term "seed" in the Abrahamic promise logically tenable? As a case of Old Testament exegesis, is his method sound and trustworthy? Would any scholar interpret in the same way now? Primarily, the question is one of Old Testament exegesis simply. Of course, the much profounder question touching the nature and limits of inspiration is involved in the discussion. Is the apostle's argu-

ment, in this case, nay, is every apostle's argument, in every case, to be accepted as absolutely faultless? Is there no place for criticism? Must we study the Bible under pressure of a dogma which excludes any appeal to our reason? What is the true ground in this most interesting of all open questions among Christians?

But, mind you, there is no question raised here touching Paul's doctrine in this epistle. That is frankly accepted. The point raised has respect solely to his invulnerability as an advocate. The question is, are we bound to accept his logic, rhetoric, grammar—every thing—on pain of being denounced as unsound in the faith and recreant to our trust as ministers of Christ's gospel? And in this particular case, are we shut up to the acceptance of his manner of dealing with the Old Testament text, no less than the Christian doctrine which is promulgated? Does a question touching New Testament use of the Old Testament texts necessarily raise a doubt in regard to New Testament teaching? Such are the questions before us. It is doubtless possible to exaggerate the importance of the chief point in these interrogatories, and I am quite willing to admit that it may be treated too lightly. Above all things, it is important we should be able to hold our heads exactly level in the investigation of great questions.

Though I took no part in the discussion which followed the reading of Prof. Grubbs' paper, I said to him privately that I thought his treatment of the subject ingenious, but too elaborate to be true. This remark led him to address me a private letter after his return to Kentucky, to which I promptly replied,

and in due time I received a second letter. In these letters he carefully restates the argument of his paper on this point, and what I am here about to write will be based upon the statement in the letters, rather than that in the paper, simply because I have the letters in my possession, and, by referring to them, will be able to avoid making any mistakes, which I could not do if I were to try to quote his paper from memory.

One word more: I shall purposely exclude from this discussion all references to the rationalistic or anti-rationalistic character of the conclusions which may be reached. With me there is only one question, viz: What is truth? However men may name or nick-name a position does not concern me at all. If it is truth, I shall be satisfied with it. Beyond that I do not care a gnat. I desire to put far from me all mere pride of opinion, all anxiety for consistency before men, and to consider this subject as though I had never made any study of it before. I must do this for truth's sake, and for my own sake as a seeker of truth. "Men may come and men may go," but God's truth (and all truth is God's) will stand forever. I shall proceed at once to the work before me.

I. Prof. Grubbs states the position he opposes as follows: "The charge against Paul is based on the supposition that he understands the term "seed" in the promise before his mind as used thus in the singular to exclude the Jews in general as *many persons*, and to point to Christ as only *one person* in opposition to those as many." "But," says Bro. Grubbs, "the apostle himself, in the 29th verse, uses the term in the singular to denote *many persons*, and that too, in ex-

planation of the compass of the very promise on which he is commenting." And the question is, "How could Paul think that the term 'seed' as it occurs in the promise excludes *many persons as individuals*, and yet represent the term in the promise as denoting a *multitude of persons?*" "It is as clear as light from the 29th verse," says Prof. Grubbs, "that the rationalistic representation of the apostle's meaning is absolutely absurd. Thus the foundation of this daring objection," our Professor tells us, "is knocked to pieces," and presumably, we may say, the superstructure falls for want of support.

To this I reply as follows:

(*a*) Bro. Grubbs' first point is sagaciously taken. It is only fair to say, and therefore it must be said, without hesitation, that in the twenty-ninth verse, which reads as follows: "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's 'seed,' and heirs according to the promise," the apostle plainly uses the Greek word for "seed" in its usual collective sense. So far Bro. G. makes no mistake.

(*b*) But is this strategic position impregnable? And does it command the main point in debate, as Bro. G. thinks it does? In other words, does this use of the term "seed" in the 29th verse render the representation of the meaning of the 16th, which Prof. G. opposes, "absolutely absurd?" I venture still to think it does not. Suppose the 29th verse had never been written. Could we then assume that Paul was ignorant of the fact that throughout the Old Testament the Hebrew word for "seed" is used to denote the collective posterity of Abraham according to the flesh? When, for instance, Paul was reading in Gene-

sis how God said to Abraham, "As the stars so shall thy seed be," could he possibly have mistaken the meaning? Could he have failed to see that the term "seed" here embraces the whole natural posterity of Abraham? Surely not. Certainly, then, very little is gained by the appeal to the 29th verse after all. It simply proves what we should have known to be true without it. Only that, and nothing more. If, now, we are going to maintain that there is a want of soundness in Paul's reasoning as an Old Testament exegete, it is plain that we must do so without assuming his ignorance of one of the simplest facts of Old Testament usage. So far, I think there can be no doubt.

II. But clearly Bro. Grubbs is not so well satisfied with his interpretation of the passage in debate as he is with his supposed refutation of what he calls the "rationalistic objection." This is by no means strange. I have seen many ingenious gentlemen in much the same predicament in the course of my life. For example, I have known learned Presbyterians and Baptists, who were perfectly certain that Peter did not mean to make baptism a condition of remission of sins in Acts 2: 38, notwithstanding the great plainness of his speech, and who would array text after text from the same Peter, and from other apostles, to prove that he could not have meant such a thing; but when it became necessary for them to tell what the said Peter really did mean in uttering those famous words, they would hesitate, beat about the bush in different directions, as if seeking to make a great show of strength, and finally end by revealing clearly the fact that they had little or no confidence in any expo-

sition they were able to offer instead of that which they had so inconsiderately rejected. Bro. Grubbs, with the 29th verse before him, seems "absolutely" certain that the apostle can not mean what he so plainly says in the 16th verse, but when it is necessary for him to tell us what he really does mean, it is clear that he is far from being satisfied with the only answer he is able to give us. Yet, as the sole alternative, he does give it, and says that, under the circumstances, he feels "justified" in doing so. I give his words as follows:

"If the contrast of unity and plurality before the mind of the apostle is not that between *one person* and *many persons*, I can see no other way to explain it than as referring to the difference between one kind of Abraham's seed, as in contrast with the plurality of kinds, so as to exclude the natural posterity, as such, from the spiritual blessings of the promise. And as this view accords with usage as to the singular and plural of the term 'seed,' and especially as it harmonizes with the whole context, I feel justified in giving the exposition presented in my paper." In his second letter he adds at this point the following: "The context clearly shows that the rationalistic exegesis involves a supposition that is *absolutely absurd*. And while I believe that I have also brought out the true meaning of the passage, I do not wish you to think that a supposed failure in this positive part of my exposition involves any thing like failure in the criticism of the rationalistic view."

On this statement I submit the following:

(*a*) The general tone of these two extracts raises Prof. Grubbs very much in my estimation, high as

was the regard in which I held him before. They reveal clearly the honest uncertainty of his own mind touching the exposition he has presented. To be introduced in this way into a thinker's very soul, so that you can see what is going on in it, is a real privilege. Bro. Grubbs' uncertainty is perfectly clear. He puts it not into his very words, but it may be read easily enough between the lines. I honor him for this transparency. I know men (only a few of them, I am glad to say) who, with the same mental uncertainty, would die before they would let you into their secret. But let there be no misunderstanding. Bro. Grubbs' uncertainty attaches only to his exposition of the disputed passage; not at all to his refutation of what he calls the rationalistic position. Here he is altogether free from uncertainty. The 29th verse settles that point, he thinks, beyond dispute. It is touching his exposition of chapter 3, verse 16, that the doubt comes in. He is like the Baptist and Presbyterian gentlemen to whom I referred a moment since. They were perfectly sure, so they would have us believe, as to what Peter did *not* mean, but when they sought to tell us what he did mean, their uncertainty became manifest. So Bro. Grubbs is sure that Paul does not mean what he seems plainly to say, but touching what he really does mean, he is not at all sure.

(*b*) Regarding Bro. Grubbs' exposition of the passage, I may say there seems little need to spend time in its refutation. I rely entirely upon Paul himself. What do his plain, straightforward words mean? This is the true battle-ground. It is a simple question of grammar and lexicography. The meaning of his words settled, the controversy is over. But his words

must be handled fairly. Nothing else can be tolerated a moment. Let us then listen to him candidly: "He saith not, And to *seeds*, as of *many;* but as of *one*, And to thy *seed*, who *is Christ*." (R. V.) There is here not even the remotest suggestion of different sorts of "seeds," as natural and spiritual, but a plain, palpable setting over against the many of Abraham's whole posterity, the *one*, *sole person*, *Christ*, in whom the divine meaning specifically centred. The apostle's contention plainly is, that from the beginning the covenant had reference to Christ, and that it includes in its promised blessings all those, and only those, who can claim heirship through Christ; and that without regard to the question of merely fleshly lineage. This contention, I should say, is sound as a dollar. But the argument from the word "seed" does not help him at all. The case is complete without it. And if it were not, the appeal to the singular number of the term "seed," as an argument addressed to the men of our day, is positively without weight, whatever significance it may have had with the Judaizers, for whom he primarily, no doubt, intended it. This is clear. But in no event can we escape the fact that Paul's contrast is between the *posterity* of Abraham according to the flesh, *as many*, and *Christ*, the center of the promise, *as one*. *His words absolutely shut us up to that meaning.* Any attempt to escape this by appealing to the context, or by suggesting that Paul could not have argued so foolishly, is positively excluded until it can be shown that his words bear another interpretation. To say that he could not have so reasoned is to beg the question at issue. I say he did so reason, and demand that his words shall set-

tle the question between us. I boldly deny the possibility of a different interpretation. That there was anything very strange in his reasoning as he plainly did reason, presents a question to be considered, and to that question your attention will soon be invited. Just now I only insist on a natural, unstrained interpretation of the apostle's own words. Like Luther in his controversy with Zwingli, I stand in this case by the words of the text, and from them I will not depart for a moment. Nor will I consent that they shall receive violence at the hands of another.

(*c*) But Bro. Grubbs' explanation of Paul's contrast between *the many* and *the one*, as referring to the difference between *one kind* of Abraham's seed and *plurality of kinds*, is shut off by the plain nature of the case. There are confessedly, I suppose, only two kinds of seed, the natural and the spiritual. There is then no *plurality of kinds* with which the *spiritual seed* can be placed in contrast. There are but two kinds. These exhaust the varieties in the case. This point is, therefore, settled.

III. In the further examination of the question before us, several matters must be taken into our account.

(*a*) It will not be contended that Paul's conversion or his inspiration wrought any essential change in his mental constitution. If the cast of his mind was logical, or otherwise, before his conversion, it remained the same to the end of his life. Nor did his inspiration effect the least change in this particular. Though supernaturally quickened, his faculties all moved in their natural orbit, and according to native drifts of tendency. It is not easy in the present con-

nection to exaggerate the importance of this stubborn fact. The individualism of the biblical writers in modes of mental activity is quite as marked and striking as it is in peculiarities of literary expression. In point of fact, it is by the former that the latter is chiefly determined. In this matter, inspiration, it is certain, cuts no figure at all. The inspired man's mind operates quite as normally as that of the uninspired man. Paul was a thinker, as well as a writer and speaker *sui generis;* that is, his mind followed always its own individual modes. For proof of this, you cannot go amiss in his writings. Every sentence almost will offer something in point.

(*b*) Next to native tendency, the training and discipline to which the mind has been subjected during its plastic stages come in to determine the character and scope of its ordinary activities. Inspiration does by no means override this law. The inspired man is never lifted entirely out of his past. The continuity of his mental history is not broken. Both native faculties and early discipline continue to assert their power, and to determine the grooves along which all mental movement takes its course. Paul would have been a different man all his life, in the character and scope of his mental operations, if he had not been a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a disciple of Gamaliel, a Pharisee of unsurpassed purity of life and burning zeal for the peculiarities of his sect. If any one should doubt the soundness of these observations, it would prove that there is yet much for him to learn in the wide and fruitful field, into the borders of which our investigation has irresistibly led us. No one can possibly understand Paul, in the deeper im-

port of his teaching, who refuses to give to these and similar considerations the weight to which they are justly entitled. Native mental tendency and the influence of early training may be said to unite in creating what a distinguished scholar has very felicitously called, "the thought-forms which lie behind style, the mould into which ideas are run." In a man of Paul's fiery temperament, this law holds with exceptional strength. To state a position like this is enough. Argument is wholly unnecessary.

(*c*) But Paul's training, as every one knows, was that of a Jewish Rabbi, a destined teacher of the Jewish law and religion. In Hallicoth and Haggadoth he had been a zealous and deeply interested student. He stood high with Gamaliel, his teacher, and all the elders and rulers of his people. His Old Testament exegesis had been fashioned, beyond doubt, after that of the rabbinical models. This was clearly inevitable. As a matter of fact, we know that he readily dropped into rabbinical modes of argument. His mind ran in rabbinical grooves, even when opposing, might and main, the rabbinical contentions. Whatever the spirit and deeper essence of his logic, its forms were distinctly Jewish, the forms of the great Rabbis, of whose sayings and reasonings he must have been a most admiring pupil. In the very nature of things, it could not have been otherwise. As an example of the facility with which he dropped into rabbinical uses of Old Testament Scripture, the passage under consideration does not stand alone in our epistle. The citation of Deut. 21: 22, 23, a passage which could have nothing whatever to do with the scope of his argument, is a case directly in point. It reads thus:

"And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree: his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt surely bury him the same day: for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee for an inheritance." Plainly, there is here no more connection with Christ than there is in the passage which tells of the mark set upon Cain. But the use of the word "curse" in the statement, "They who are of the law are under its curse," seems to have called up the same word in the Deuteronomic passage, and connecting the hanging and curse of that passage with the hanging of Christ on the cross, he applies it without hesitation to his argument. The idea that it has the least weight as a Scripture proof in the case is without a shadow of rational support. The use made of Genesis 21: 10, and its connection, in 4: 24 of our epistle, is another instance to my purpose. The story of Sarah and Hagar and their children is a very touching one, but there is no allegory in it, except as Paul, after the manner of the Jewish teachers, chooses to see one in order to add to the effect of his general contention against the Judaizers. I do not say, of course, that his use of the incident is not legitimate for the purpose of his discussion, in the sense indicated, but simply that it is quite in the style, and according to the exegetical methods of the Rabbis of his time, and that as a Scripture proof of the point he was arguing, it has no weight at all.

(*d*) But in addition to all this, it seems quite clear that Paul, in several instances, takes up mere Jewish traditions, which are altogether without satis-

factory biblical support, and works them into his reasoning as though they were undisputed facts. The first example I cite is 3: 19 of our present epistle: "It (the law) was ordained through ANGELS in the hands of a mediator." Now the book of Exodus says nothing at all of any angels in connection with the giving of the law at Sinai. There is simply no Old Testament foundation for the idea, and all New Testament allusions to it must be explained without the claim of Old Testament support. Certainly it is possible for one to say, if he can honestly believe it, that the New Testament writers spoke, in such cases, by the authority of their own inspiration. But facts are against this theory. (1) The utter want of a biblical foundation; (2) The fact that the Jews have such a tradition, and that the New Testament writers must have been acquainted with it. Paul must have known the tradition, and that it was without even the shadow of biblical support.

The reference in 1 Cor. 10: 4, "They drank of that spiritual Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ," is another case of the same sort. The history says nothing of any "rock which followed them," but Jewish tradition does, and Paul uses the tradition in his epistle as though there was no question in regard to it. So also, the mention of Jannes and Jambres in 2 Tim. 3: 8. The history says nothing of these men in connection with the work of Moses in Egypt, but Jewish tradition says much. What shall we say, then? that the New Testament allusions to such traditions must be regarded as inspired vouchers of their genuine historicity? By no means. Far be such a notion from us, my brethren. It is too puerile

for intelligent toleration. The New Testament references in such cases must be explained and justified on other grounds. But the facts are very instructive certainly, and it will be our own fault if we disregard the lesson they so obviously suggest.* The sum, then, of what I here urge is this: Paul was a Jew, his whole training had been Jewish, and the notion that this training might have little or nothing to do with shaping his intellectual development for all time to come is a proposition too unreasonable to be entertained for a single moment.

III. In view of the facts now before us, what more is necessary to an intelligent conclusion? The logical outcome seems plain enough. Let us follow truth with unfaltering step. This great epistle to the Galatians reveals, throughout, the quickened, anxious mood in which it was written. Towards the Galatian disciples, whom he had himself won to Christ, it is filled with proofs of the writer's deepest affection and tenderest sympathy. As regards the Judaizers, it manifests the presence of a burning but well-controlled indignation. It was written rapidly, one would say, and under pressure of strong emotion. Far more anxious about the substance of his great argument than the mere forms in which the minor parts of it should be cast, he pressed eagerly forward to the goal set before him. He had come to Christ a full-grown man in mind and culture. His intellect had already taken its characteristic cast for life. As he pressed forward in the ardor of composition, the mental habitudes, which had grown to be "second nature" to

*See Canon Farrar's Life of Paul, Excursus 4, page 701.

him, silently asserted their authority, and assumed control of his reasoning processes. It is the great beauty of inspiration, as a method of revealing truth, that the divine thought comes to us surcharged with the personal emotions of the inspired thinker; touched and vitalized, we may say, with the throbbings of his deepest inner life. As an inspired man, Paul thought, no doubt, under the quickening presence of the Holy Spirit, but none the less, on that account, in modes and forms which were determined by his own idiosyncracies. On occasion he fell readily into the methods of exegesis and argument in which he had been so carefully trained. Of this the contents of our present epistle, as we have seen, are a sufficient demonstration. But, in the nature of things, it could not have been otherwise. On *apriori* grounds alone this conclusion is entirely certain. What, then, can be lost by an honest admission of all the facts in the case? Plainly, nothing. Besides, truth is everything; and what is true ought to be firmly held and frankly declared. There is here, certainly, no room for doubt. The intellectual moods and exegetical methods of the epistle to the Galatians, it is perfectly safe to say, are those of Gamaliel's pupil, lifted to the loftier atmosphere of Christian faith and filled with the joyous hopes of the everlasting gospel.

It may then be said, without the least hesitation: (1) Professor Grubbs' exposition of the passage under examination is untenable. It can not be accepted. Tested by sound hermeneutical principles, it is an impossible interpretation. The apostle's plain words positively refuse to yield *his* meaning.

(2) In view of this fact, his reliance on the 29th

verse as a refutation of what he pleases to call the "rationalistic objection" is clearly not justified. He is in the situation of the preacher who undertakes to show that Peter did not mean what he said on Pentecost, by quoting against him what he said at the house of Cornelius, Acts 10: 43. His argument, at best, only makes the apostle contradict himself. And until he can give us an exposition of the 16th verse which shall meet the demands of sound hermeneutical principles, his appeal to the 29th verse should be regarded as having no weight at all.

(3) But in view of all the facts here presented, and apart from the consideration just urged, his dependence on the 29th verse is clearly not justified. *The assumed force of the incongruity between the reasoning in the 16th verse and the use of the word "seed" in the 29th, is completely destroyed by showing that the apostle here employs a rabbinical form of exegesis which takes not the least account of such incongruities.* This affirmation I hold to be completely justified by the undeniable facts adduced in my argument.

But touching the exegetical methods of the rabbinical schools, it may be well that I should be somewhat more explicit. I shall submit, therefore, a few of their rules of interpretation with illustrative examples, which will make everything plain. It is not pretended, of course, that Paul could have followed all their vagaries; only that in his own independent way he wrought under the influence of their rules, and according to their general methods. Indeed, it is coming to be quite well understood that all the apostles, as Jews in training, not only shared in the prevailing

Jewish ideas of Scripture, but followed the generally accepted Jewish methods in their interpretation of Old Testament texts. The rules, of which I am here about to give only a few, were prepared by Elieser Ben Jose, a distinguished Pentateuchal scholar of the second century of our era. I copy them from McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, the high character of which is a sufficient voucher for their accuracy and genuineness. (See Article Midrash).

Rule I. By the superfluous use of the three particles (Hebrew text given here), the Scriptures indicate in a three-fold manner, that something more is included in the text than the apparent declaration would seem to imply. Example, Gen. 21: 1: "And the Lord visited Sarah, (Hebrew text given):" The superfluous particle which sometimes denotes *with* is here used to show that *with* Sarah the Lord also visited other barren women.

Rule III. If words denoting inclusion follow each other, several things are included. Example, 1 Sam. 17: 36: "Thy servant slew *also* the lion, *also* the bear." Here three superfluous particles follow each other to show that he slew *three other animals* besides the two expressly mentioned in the text.

Rule IV. If words denoting exclusion follow each other, several things are excluded. Example, Numbers 12: 2: "Hath the Lord indeed only spoken to Moses? Hath he not also spoken to us?" Here the superfluous expressions (Heb. given) which follow each other, denote that the Lord spoke to Miriam and Aaron before he spoke to Moses, thus not only without the law-giver *being present* to it, but *before* God spoke to him, and not only did he speak to Aaron, but also to

Miriam, so that there is here a two-fold exclusion.

Rule X. "The Scriptures repeat a thing in order to indicate thereby something special. Example, Jeremiah 7: 4: Trust ye not in lying words, saying, 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord.' The last phrase is here repeated *three times* to indicate that though his people, Israel, celebrate the feasts in the temple *three times* every year, the Lord will not regard it, because they do not amend their ways."

Rule XII. A subject often explains itself while it imparts information on other subjects. Example: "Its cry shall arise like that of a serpent." Jeremiah 46: 22. This means that the serpent must have raised a tremendous cry after the curse pronounced against it, since we are nowhere else told that there was any occasion on which it cried—and Egypt raises an equally loud cry—thus giving information on another subject while explaining itself. (See text and context in Jeremiah, R. V.)

But these examples of rabbinical hermeneutics are quite enough. There are, in all, 32 of these rules. It might be well, if the professors in our Bible colleges would add the entire series to the hermeneutical apparatus already in use in their classes. I do not know how the suggestion may impress them, but I give it freely, without charge.

But, seriously, no one can fail to notice how artificial and arbitrary these rules are. As canons of biblical interpretation, they are unscientific and absurd from beginning to end. Yet we cannot fail to be struck with their resemblance to certain more modern methods, methods far too prevalent, which make the

Bible a sort of fetich to many people from whom we would gladly expect better things. Why, yes, dear Dr. Briggs, you are not mistaken at this point. Go on with your good work, so nobly begun. The world needs it even more than you know.

I had marked some specimens of interpretation from the Talmudists to complete the view here so briefly presented, but they are scarcely worth the space they would occupy. It is proved from the Scripture that God prays, and that he wears phylacters. By similar methods, it is shown how God employs his time in reciting lessons learned from the Rabbis, and how the law of God came to be called the law of Moses, as in Malachi 4: 4. But the above must suffice, at present. Certainly Paul could not descend to ingenious trifling after this fashion. And yet a thorough training in the hermeneutical rules and presuppositions of which such trifling is a natural fruitage, in less ingenuous and thoughtful natures, could not have been without its effect. That he rabbinized, in his own higher way, on fit occasions, is, as we have seen, indisputable. God's word, as it reaches us through Paul, takes on a certain Pauline coloring, and it is to this fact that we invite the strictest and most serious attention. We must not, in interpreting the great apostle, lose sight of what it involves for a single moment. To do so is to fail to understand the divine message which he brings us.

And, now, finally: If the patient reader is not fully satisfied with the solution of the problem we have been considering, and which has been presented at such length, it may help him to remember that Paul wrote with the Judaizers who had wrought such mis-

chief in the Galatian churches in full view. He never takes his eye off them for a moment. He was thinking of them in every sentence which he penned. And if we should suppose that the use certainly made of the term "seed," in the passage in controversy, could hardly have commended itself to his judgment as soundly logical, we have only to reflect that he knew thoroughly the methods of his Judaizing antagonists, and could calculate safely as to the weight it would have with them. It is beyond doubt that he would seek to adapt his argument to their controversial forms. What hinders us, then, from explaining the passage as an *argumentum ad hominem?* Professor Grubbs' exposition is positively shut out. If we must have something which does not collide too sharply with traditional ideas, the *ad hominem* solution is just the thing we are looking for. At any angle of vision, we must say the argument is addressed to the Judaizers, rather than to Paul's Galatian converts, who could not have understood it, or perceived its force. Considering this point candidly, then, what hinders the explanation here proposed? I protest that I can see no valid objection to it. Nor could Paul have hesitated to use such an argument. If he could properly plead his Pharisaism before the Jewish Sanhedrim (Acts 23: 6, 7), much more might he meet the Judaizers with an interpretation justified by their own rules, and in strictest accord with their constant use of the sacred text. What, then, hinders the *ad hominem* explanation of the passage? Clearly nothing at all.

But, for myself, I wish to say plainly that I find no need of such a solution. The true explanation lies

much deeper, and has been clearly indicated in the body of my argument. Only they can feel the need of the *ad hominem* explanation whose theory of inspiration is essentially unbiblical; that is, incapable of being reconciled with the certain facts of Scripture. I only care to add, in this connection, that a theory of inspiration which has no place for the human elements, which have been shown to exist in the Pauline epistles, has survived too long already. It cannot endure the light of honest criticism much longer. Meantime, the most pressing need of the hour is a sound and thoroughly trustworthy view of sacred Scripture itself. It is not too much to say that we are fairly in the way to obtain such a view, and that, when obtained, we shall reject with equal confidence and satisfaction the assumptions of an unreasoning traditionalism on the one hand and the impossible inferences of rationalistic extremists on the other.

But till this point is gained the battle will go on, whether we like it or not. It is perhaps well that it should be so. Only the things which can not be shaken have any divine right to remain. To these unshakable things, and to these only, may God help us to be loyal and constant to the end.

A SUPPLEMENTAL OUTLOOK.

After the foregoing had been written, I obtained from the Student Publishing Company, Hartford, Conn., a copy of Prof. G. B. Stevens' excellent little commentary on Galatians. The book was fresh from the press, and I had been awaiting its appearance with lively interest. I turned at once to see what our learned and thoroughly orthodox Professor would

have to say touching the passages involved in our present discussion. The result was, upon the whole, gratifying, and, as I thought, confirmative of the position I had taken. The following extract will be of interest to the Lectureship, in this connection.

"The various methods of explaining this difficult passage may be summarized thus: (*a*) The object of Paul is to show that the promise does not apply to Abraham's seed in a literal sense, but to one class of his descendants, his spiritual children. (So Augustine, Tholuck, Olshausen; similarly, Ellicott, Lightfoot). (*b*) The argument with Paul turns on the use in the Old Testament of the singular number, and not the plural (sperma, not spermata). His meaning is: Since the singular number is used, the passage proves that one individual must be referred to, and that must be Christ. The passage can not refer to many descendents of Abraham, but must refer to one, that anti-typical Son of Abraham who has the closest spiritual relationship with Abraham, the man of faith, viz: Christ. In the original, however, the word for seed (zera) is a collective noun as it regularly is in the Old Testament in such cases. (So Meyer, Weiss and German critics generally)."

At this point I beg leave to submit, as a clearer statement of the view defended in my paper, the following from the pen of Prof. C. H. Toy:

"The promise, says Paul, was to Abraham and his seed, not the plural 'seeds,' as if many were intended, but the promise refers to one person, 'thy seed,' which he says is Christ. It is well known that the Hebrew word used in Genesis is a collective noun, identical in meaning with our 'posterity,' and can-

not of itself, by virtue of its form, point to an individual. If such a reference to an individual is intended, it must be made clear by the context. But in the Old Testament passage cited, there is no such explanatory mention of an individual; on the contrary, the context shows that it is the nation Israel that is meant, nor is there in all the Old Testament a passage suggesting any other interpretion for the expression in question." (In Old Testament Student for December, 1888, p. 129).

I return now to Prof. Stevens' note. Please give close attention:

"*Formaliter*, the latter view is more nearly correct; *materialiter*, the former. Paul's method of argument is undoubtedly rabbinic and he draws more from the use of the singular than an exact exegesis of the Old Testament can directly justify, but not more than according to the typical view of prophecy which is pervading in the New Testament, can be justly claimed to be *involved* in the passage. The essential idea is this: The promise to Abraham meets its true, ideal fulfillment only in Christ. The argument, if formally unwarranted, rests nevertheless on the profound view of Old Testament prophecy and history as looking forward to Christ, and reaching its culmination only n him. Wiessler justly says, (*com. in loco*): That the idea of the Messiah is veiled in the Abrahamic promise, and that we may understand the expression 'seed of Abraham' in the light of later revelation to refer really to the Messiah, is the thoroughly correct view upon which the whole explanation of Paul rests, but the form in which he incidentally expresses this correct view in this passage is due to his rabbinic

training." It is to be remembered that Paul's argument by no means rests upon this particular interpretation. "Speaking on this point, Luther quaintly and aptly says that this argument is but the painting of the house which has already been built."

All of which, my brethren, when translated into terms of simple, honest, straightforward common sense, only means that, while the apostle's main contention is thoroughly sustained by the general scope of his argument—a fact of which I have not the slightest doubt—the particular point in the 16th verse, however weighty it may have seemed to the Judaizers in Jerusalem and Galatia, is not, to a man of the 19th century, as a matter of logic, worth the scrap of papyrus roll on which it was originally formulated. On such a question I judge that plain, honest words are the best.

A few reflections on the general outlook, if the Lectureship please, and I shall have done. In the *Christian-Evangelist* of a recent date, I find the following:

"I may as well confess openly that I am kindly disposed towards what has come to be known as the Higher Criticism and New Theology; but I have feared, and do fear, the result. I have thought of their possible influence, especially on the moral and religious side. I have said to myself: "Can I, with my views of the Bible, develop such a faith in God, and in his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord; and can I build up such a Christian character as the faith and character of my dear father, with his old-fashioned notions of the Scriptures? Can I develop this strong faith? Can I build up such a character? The Bible is not to me what it was to my father. My view of

the Bible makes it, to me, a better and more helpful volume than the traditional view of the book. But what will be the general effect of these new conceptions of the Bible and its teachings on character? This is my question."

I do not know what my brother means by the use of the equivocal expression, "The New Theology," but I think it likely he employs it to cover something with which I have not the least sympathy. However this may be, I take occasion to say here with all the emphasis I can command, that his question touching the influence of the Higher Criticism on faith and character does not give me the least anxiety. I have none of the fear which this question implies. The writer, indeed, is not consistent with himself. He says: "My view of the Bible makes it to me a better and more helpful volume than the traditional view of the book." Why, then, does he fear the effect of his view on character? That which is most helpful must tend to the formation of the highest character. Indeed, the expression of this fear as to the effect on character betrays a misapprehension of the entire situation, so far as the necessary results of the higher criticism are concerned. The higher criticism, in its legitimate effects, is an aid to the truest and grandest faith. The Bible is a larger and better book to me than it was to my father. It is a grander and diviner book to me than it can be, to-day, to any one who regards it in the traditional way. It is not a book written under a sort of quasi-mechanical control of the human faculties of the men whose names appear in it as authors. It is, on the contrary, a book brimful of the life and richest experiences of the most

heroic men that have inhabited our planet in all the historical centuries. The Spirit of God is in it, but these men are in it too. Both the divine and the human are in it, in a sense too deep, and full, and holy, to be expressed by any poor words of mine. The questions with which it deals were real questions to the real men whose mighty thoughts have come down to us on its pages. We have not here the painted achievements of painted heroes, to paraphase the words of Staupitz to Luther, but the loftiest thoughts of loftiest souls, under the quickening influence of the Spirit of our God. That is what inspiration is, or it is nothing; nothing, unless a delusion and a snare. Any conception of inspiration that does not carry in it the normal activities of the inspired man's own soul, no less than the quickening agency of the Holy Spirit, is a false and bewildering conception. And so the limitations, on the human side, come in to play their part. So it is seen that the truth of the Spirit comes to us clothed in the intellectual forms, touched with the vital experiences, and manifesting the limitations, as to age and individuality, of the grand souls through whom God has given it to the world. In this view, the Bible is a thing of life. It is that, moreover, to-day, no less than two or three thousand years ago. The Bible, I repeat, is more to me than it could be to my father. The men of the Bible, as I see them now, were real men, men of actual flesh and blood, like the rest of us, and not mere speaking or writing automatons. Oh! if I am not a better man than my dear father was, it is my own fault, and is in no sense due to the view which I entertain of the Bible. I long held my father's view.

I am not ignorant of the sources of its power, but I am distinctly conscious of the higher influence on character of that which, on grounds altogether sufficient, I now accept in place of it. I have learned to follow, in the Bible, as my father could not, the slow, toilsome progress of the world's most reverent and thoughtful spirits along the great lines of truth which culminate in Jesus, and his gracious gospel to a dying world. I have learned to estimate the Bible, not by the immature and inadequate representations of God and divine things which constantly appear in the earlier stages of the growth of its material, and also of its literary production, but by its glorious, final outcome in the soul-satisfying and soul-renewing manifestation of God's saving love in the new and everlasting covenant. I have learned that in a gradual revelation, a revelation running through many centuries, truth and error, so to say, must have temporarily co-existed in the minds even of law-givers and prophets divinely guided. I can see clearly that the human mind has never been able, in a moment, as it were, to drop out all old ideas inconsistent with any new knowledge which may have come to it; that the proper correlation and co-ordination of truth, in the case of constantly increasing knowledge, is the work of patient, painstaking and conscientious discrimination. The discovery of the progressive character of the Biblical revelation has furnished the means of solving more Biblical problems than all the elaborate distinctions and definitions of scholastics, mediæval or modern, put together. This discovery, like that of the Copernican Astronomy, has brought a new canon of interpretation to the aid of the Bible student, in

the light of which difficulties vanish as mists and shadows disappear before the rising sun. My maternal grandfather, as I well remember, believed firmly in witchcraft, and was sure that he had been "deviled" (to use his own expression) by the uncanny arts of human beings in league with Satan, at sundry times and in many ways. He would have devoutly quoted the Bible to justify himself in this belief. My father, without seeing his way very clearly, doubtless supposed that Pharaoh's magicians "did the same things with their enchantments" that Moses did by the power of God, and that the sorceress of Endor really brought back the spirit of stern old Samuel from its resting-place in Abraham's bosom to speak words of fateful significance to the disgusted and despairing king of Israel. All our fathers, your fathers and mine, certainly held that the indiscriminate slaughter of men, women and children, by the Israelites, was according to a divine commandment, explicitly given, and never thought of a different view as possible to a loyal disciple of Jesus Christ. We know better now. The doctrine of gradual revelation truly conceived, makes a wonderful change in all this. Our God is no longer the God of the Jews only, but the God of the Gentiles also. He takes note, he has always taken note, of the anguish of every sorrowing heart in the wide world. He was as near to the cast-out Hagar in the wilderness of Beersheba as to faithful Sarah in the tent of her Lord Abraham. In all such instances as these, the Biblical statements must be understood to represent the human conception, rather than the Omniscient and Eternal God. There is no help for it, if the Bible is to retain, as I am sure

it will retain, its hold on human hearts. We must see in these things the temporary human elements, which necessarily mingled themselves with the eternal truths of divine revelation in the earlier and cruder stages of its marvelous progress through the centuries. Does any one say, like Nicodemus, How can these things be? I answer, How could it be otherwise? The child has knowledge, but knowledge crudely and inadequately held. "When I was a child, I thought as a child," says Paul, "but when I became a man, I put away childish things." This does not mean that all his old childish knowledge had been discarded, thrown away, but that the knowledge of childhood, so far as it was real, had passed into higher and more satisfactory forms, the errors of childhood having been eliminated in the processes of growth. Brethren, have you read the so-called imprecatory Psalms? And do you not see that errors, both of head and heart, co-existed with much truth and much piety, in the souls of these Psalmists? Explain these imprecatory Psalms to your own satisfaction, and you will have gained a point of view that will justify to you all that I have said, and bring to you, besides, a blessing for which you can never be sufficiently thankful. The true meaning of a gradual revelation is indeed a late discovery, but it is one of the grandest of all the circling centuries of human history.

I thank God that I have lived to know its vast significance. I thank him because this knowledge has made the Bible a more wonderful book to me than it was to my father, or any of your fathers. I thank him, because it enables me to reverence and love the Bible, as otherwise I could not have reverenced and

loved it. I see more clearly the organic relation of the several parts of the Bible to each other. I see the growth of revealed truth through the ages, as I see growth in knowledge from childhood to manhood; a growth accomplished by new truth gained and old mistakes discarded, as rapidly as their inconsistency with new truth became apparent. In Christ I perceive clearly the culmination of God's eternal purpose, and the vindication of his wisdom, in this slow approach to an adequate expression of his fatherly love for human souls.

Whatever refuses to correlate fully with this final outcome is not of the essence or substance of redemption, as divinely conceived and patiently unfolded from the beginning. This grand outcome is the key to the entire book; by it all mysteries are solved, all difficulties explained. I bless God that the Bible means so much more to me than it did to my father! I pray that, in corresponding ratio, my life, even mine, may be more like that of the Blessed Christ, who is in his own Person the crown and completion of God's wonderful self-revelation to our sinning and sorrowing world. And now to his great name, through Jesus Christ, be majesty and glory, might and dominion and praises, forever and ever. Amen.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY'S ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOSPEL TRUST.

BENJ. L. SMITH.

We are educated by solving problems. It is wonderful how many and what difficult problems are solved in the first four years of a child's life; the problems of eating, walking, learning the use and limitations of the bodily organs, learning a language, the force of gravity—these and a hundred others must be met and solved in order to the education of the child. The child sometimes meets a problem which stands in the way of all progress until it is rightly solved—some gordian knot that refuses to be cut—some equation which can not be understood or utilized until he finds the value of the unknown quantity; but which, when this value is found, readily lends itself to the solution of still other equations.

Thus from problem to problem the child-mind goes toward education, and the education is in direct proportion to the problems met and solved.

There is a larger thing than the child which is educated in the same way—by the solution of problems. This larger thing is the restless, abiding thing called humanity. The training of the child we call education, the training of the race we call civilization, and both are attained by the same method, the right solving of the problems set before them.

The boy has before him the problem of school days and their opportunities. It is a problem, the answer to which is his position in the world's life work, whether he shall be a hewer of wood and a drawer of water, or a leader among his fellows.

The young man has the problem of a career: wha solution will he present? The result is the settlement of life plans and positions. These problems of life are only solved in the living.

So the race has had its problems, and its advance in civilization is marked by the answers the race has found for its problems.

To special centuries special problems have been given. As all problems are not pressed at once upon the individual, but become, as we grow to manhood, more and more difficult, so to the race special problems are presented at special times. To the last century was presented this question: Does government exist for the benefit of the governed or the governing classes? The answer of the century is given in the American Revolutionized Republic, and repeated with terrible emphasis in the French Revolution.

To the seventeenth century was presented the problem of the Feudal system: Shall the Feudal lords own the peasant classes? Shall all privileges come as special grants from the lords? May these lords transfer their vassals as one would an ox or a horse? The answer was the breaking up of Feudalism.

The human mind must grow. The tendency is for men to make for the nselves systems of thought and habit. Under these systems they reach the limits of the system. Then all growth stops for a time; there is a time of adaptation, a time of friction between the

man and the system. If the system is flexible some adaptation can be had; if it is inflexible there is a time of worry and then a breaking up of the system; for the man must grow. So in the seventeenth century the race had reached the limits of its possibilities under the feudal system. There was a time of uneasiness, a time of friction, and behold, at last the problem was solved. Feudalism passed away because it could not adapt itself to the growing race.

To another century the problem assumed a religious form, and its answer was the Reformation. To another the problem was that of the geography of the earth, and the answer was the discovery of America. Thus the race is being educated by its solution of the problems of living, and the result is a constantly advancing civilization.

The nineteenth century has had its problems, and its final answers are being given. Our century has two claims to greatness: first, the numerous inventions and triumphs in applied science; add to this its record in Christian missions, and then I submit that we have every claim of this century to be called great. The nineteenth century has solved no large geographical questions, it has simply filled in details; it has not given a new thought in dogmatic theology—indeed dogmatic theology has lost much of its former power; it has not presented a new model in human government. It has added little, if anything, to the philosophical knowledge of the race, if this be not heresy to the Hegelian school.

The nineteenth century has been a great boaster. It has not failed to tell the world the wonderful things it thinks of itself, but it does not compare with the

sixteenth century either in great names or great deeds.

Our century has solved some problems and the solutions have been for the advancement of the race; but the nineteenth century grows old; the wrinkled face, the bent form, proclaim that age is upon her; like an old person she deals in reminiscence and in story. Our century lives in the past; her heroes are buried, and I ask you to note that the life of the century is going out in restlessness. After all its boasted achievements, this century is *most dissatisfied* and *most discontented* in its last decade. We tell of our inventions, but we are wholly dissatisfied with our inventions. It is the century of steam, but at its close we are not at all satisfied with steam, and are hoping for a better motor than steam, presumably electricity. We have boasted of our educational system, but we are far from being satisfied with a system that turns out boys and girls like stoves from a foundry, all of one pattern and all equally unfitted for practical life-work.

We have sung of the glory of our civil institutions, but one of the marks of these years is the growing discontent of the people.

We are told by the leaders of the church that as yet we have only been playing at Christian missions, and when the Christian world sets rightly to work the whole world will easily be evangelized in one generation. The church has made a failure in carrying out the Commission.

The church has likewise failed in not incorporating itself more fully into the daily life of the people. The church is not loved by the masses to-day as it ought

to be. The working classes of the Republic are estranged from the Church of God.

The Church has failed to lead the greatest reforms of the century. The temperance reform in its early work was led largely from beyond church lines; the Washingtonian movement was extra-ecclesiastical; the Sons of Temperance was remarkably so; the Good Templars were led by those without the lines of church membership, and it is only in the latest phase of the matter that the church has spoken with no uncertain sound, for I believe the Prohibitory movement is being led by Christian people.

The abolition of slavery was another reform accomplished without the leadership of the church; the early abolitionists were frozen out of church fellowship.

So now on the Labor Question—that wonderful unrest which means in its friction the larger life of our laboring classes—on this subject the pulpit is marvelously timid in speaking as justice and humanity demand. Whenever the question takes form as between man and money; between lives and profits; between vested wrongs and the people, the Church should speak earnestly and mightily for the man, for man is greater than institutions, and the church is set for the safety of the man. But we see our teachers wrestling with the problem of the estrangement of the working classes from the church, who regard it as an instrument of their oppression, used by employers to keep them in the dust and increase their own profits.

There is a giant in the land whose name is Labor. Long, Samson-like, he has been willing to toil and

sweat for others; now he is beginning to ask questions. "I dig and build railroads; why am I compelled to walk?" "I build the palace cars; why must I forever ride in the smoking cars?" "I build mansions; why must my little family live in a hovel?" "I build school-houses; why must my children leave school so young in life?" These and a hundred similar questions are being asked. Is the *church leading* toward the emancipation of the laboring man? Does the church help him better his condition? Nay, the church is *not holding* the highest position as leader of the best agencies to secure the good of the bodies and souls of men. Another evidence of the failure of the church of this century to realize the full extent of its mission, is the existence and support of so many lodges. People expect to find certain benefits in association. They have not found these in the church, and lodges have been organized to meet the deficiency. The greatest failure has been along the line of divided energies; denominationalism has flourished like a weed, and the waste of energies and men and money has been enormous.

Looking at these things, you will note that they are all failures of administration. We ask, "What must the church do to maintain a position of influential leadership upon the life, the character, and the love of that great incoming century, with its wonderful possibilities for God and the good?"

The church faces this problem, at the close of the century—the best possible administration of the Gospel trust.

The church during the Middle Ages assumed the habits of a sect. She lived for herself alone, and

when the Reformation came, and with it the opportunity to lay hold upon the entire life of the people with helpful power, the leaders held back. Like the Jews of old, they knew not the day of their visitation. They were careful for formal Christianity, for its correct statement, and for the public worship; but they cared nothing for the general welfare of mankind. The ascetic tendency, emphasizing the false teaching that the height of Christian excellence was to be found in the solitary life and in breaking away from all social obligations, pushed the church away from general influence. The teaching which transferred the aim of the church from this world to the world to come, dwarfed the conception of the church's work and life here, and withdrew the leaders from their true work. The teachers of the church of the Middle Ages, from Jerome downward, had no public spirit. The separation of the clergy from the laity tended to withdraw the church more and more from the daily lives of the people; the narrowness and bigotry of our latent Puritanism tends to emphasize this withdrawal. These ideas are a part of our unconscious inheritance from the Middle Ages, and on account of our traditional views the Church of God does not assume its legitimate place in the world's life. We must reach the larger conception, that wherever men think and suffer, there the helpfulness of the Church of God must be found to make them think rightly, and to rightly enjoy the best things.

It seems to me that the genius of Christianity requires us to conceive of it, not as separate from life, but as penetrating and vivifying the entire life, both spiritual and secular. Redemption is not to take us

out of the world, but to keep us in the world, to bless, to lighten, to be salt, to be leaven, and thus to draw all our plans and purposes into fellowship with God and the good, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We see the parable of the feeding of the five thousand worked inversed every day. The disciples of our Lord are sending the people into the villages to buy food; *our Lord intends that we should give it to them.*

Jesus never sent them away. Let the church have many mansions, and let no man go away because there is not enough for him at home.

I know we have sent so many people away into the villages to buy food, that we would be overawed and shocked, as much as the disciples were, at the suggestion that we should provide for them, but our Lord meant it, and means it. The church must bestir herself at the call of opportunity. "They need not depart; give ye them to eat."

Drummond demonstrates, in his chapter on Biogenesis, that there is a law running through the natural and spiritual world, that there is no passing from one kingdom into the next higher, except by reaching down from the higher kingdom, and drawing the lower into the higher.

No elements can possibly move by development from the mineral into the vegetable kingdom, or from the vegetable into the animal, or from the animal into the mental. So also in the spiritual life, to effect progress, there must be the help from beyond.

This help in spiritual life is two-fold; the divine help, embodied in the Gospel of the Christ of God, which is the power of God unto the higher life; and the human element. This treasure hath he committed

to you and myself, or, as our own shibboleth puts it, "The gospel flows through human elements, or it does not flow at all."

On the divine side, God's part, the gospel is like light, capable of analysis, of being studied, and of a thousand applications to human affairs, yet incapable of improvement by man.

On the human side, the gospel is an estate made over by testament to the world, and we are its trustees. The administration of this estate is placed in our hands; and without being pessimistic or even discouraged, I think it can be shown that our administration is not the best, and our study to-day shall be along the lines of the administration of the gospel so that all the beneficiaries of the will may receive the intended help.

Our minds naturally turn to the next century as being for us the fulfillment of all hopes. As one, pensive on New Year's day, wonders what the new year has in store for him, so we are beginning to wonder, and ask what the twentieth century has in store for the Church of God.

That century, to my mind, promises to be the most magnificent in the history of the race—greater than our greatest century, the fifteenth, which boasted of its Leonardo de Vinci, Michael Angelo, Luther, Titian and Columbus; far greater than our own century.

Of course we shall prophesy for that age the large-minded liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. Traditionalism, opinionism, will be held of little moment.

The theology will be Christocentric. It seems to me that the divine Sonship of Christ will be more and

more the test of fellowship—the unrevisable creed. The wish may be father to the thought, but the indications are that this personal center for the world's faith is winning its way as the attractive point of the best thought. When we learn of the idolatry of the human creeds a half century ago, and remember the tyranny of those creeds, and the intolerant opinionism of those days, and see how the church has emancipated herself from that bondage, I think that we will be ready by the twentieth century to preach the funeral sermon of the creed, from the text, "Where the wicked cease from troubling," and apply to the church the consolation, "and the weary are at rest," and on the next Lord's day preach the true Easter sermon, "Christ has risen from the dead," risen in the hearts of his people, and the new resurrection will crown him as supreme object of the world's faith and hope. Thus he will have become the pillar of the people's hope, the center of the world's desire.

I wish I could make plain to you my conception of that large doctrinal liberty which makes plain a pathway which passes on the one hand the cemetery of opinionism, and avoids on the other the marsh of license. Between tyranny and license will be the pathway of that liberty.

In reaching this large liberty of belief, there will be loss; a wagon passing over the road in spring, if it progresses, must lose some mud, and that driver makes little headway who drives slowly to keep all the mud on his wheels. We should be content to let the mud fall, and go on our way toward the mark of the prize. Let us lose with complacency all narrow-minded opinionism, and let the church go on toward

her rightful leadership of the thought of the twentieth century.

God give us a man—a large man—a Moses and a Johsua rolled into one—a Campbell, a Procter and a Garfield combined, to lead us into that largest liberty, which yet restrains from license with divine things.

Instead of making the church one among many agencies for upbuilding the race, I would rather make the many into one, write over the portal of every church-front, the call to all men, "Ye need not depart," and try to supply there every thing that man can need for his healthy edification and culture, believing that this is all within the boundaries of Christ's conception of his own church.

We may not realize it, but men are coming who can read the whole story of the world's needs and of God's supply; our ears are filled with the noises; our eyes are divided so we cannot see all; but hearts are coming, and brighter minds, which will feel and understand all this.

"Give ye them to eat"—and the thing given grows in the giving. Oh! hungry wanderers! return, return; ye need not depart.

Under the twentieth century *administration*, of the gospel, the church-house will differ materially and largely from the one of to-day. It will be built as a workshop for certain kinds of work. If my ideal is to be realized, and the church is to put itself more and more into the life of the people, its house is to be built and used as a workshop.

It will contain from twenty to twenty-five rooms, capable of numerous changes of size, shape and use. By folding and sliding doors, these rooms will be en-

smalled or enlarged as the case may demand. The furniture will be such as to make it a home-like, cheerful place.

It will be open seven days and seven nights in the week, and will include library, reading room, bath rooms, parlors, kitchen, lecture room and reception room, all capable of being thrown into one large audience room when occasion demands. Whatever people find in lines of social, moral and benevolent work, I would have them find in the ideal church.

I think the church will have a free dispensary, where the services of a good physician and free medicine will be given to the very needy. That church will have a loan fund, from which the suffering poor can borrow small sums to help them bear their heavy burdens, and bridge over times of need, without losing their self-respect, and being ranked as paupers.

Every good cause should find in that building a home:

Office of Society for Organizing Charity, Room L.

Office of W. C. T. U., Room G.

Office of Y. M. C. A., Room M.

Office of State Mission Board, Room N.

Office of a Friendly and Free Lodging, Room O.

Friendly Home free to-day for strangers, Room R.

It seems to me the lodge flourishes for two reasons: Its fellowship and its helpfulness in time of need.

A brother visited in a strange city an Odd Fellows' Lodge on Friday night, and a church on the following Lord's day. He told me of the contrast. At the lodge there was a personal greeting: "Who are you?" Introductions to others. "Call around and see me at my place of business," and "Can I be

of any help to you while you are in the city," and a cordial "Come again." At the church a dignified and formal letting alone; no welcome, no introduction, no recognition, and no invitation to come again. In the ideal church the best members serve as ushers, and their special duty is to treat the visitors so kindly that they will want to come again, and will keep on coming.

A member of the church in Blankton was sick ten weeks. The lodge sent a nurse around; sent, not as charity, but as dues, the sum of $4.00 per week, that being the weekly benefit due brethren during sickness, and some members of the lodge called daily to inquire as to his welfare.

The church did nothing for eight long weeks; nobody called, except the pastor, for four weeks; finally a purse was made up and presented to the brother. Now, in the church of the twentieth century, this will all be changed; then there will be three or four trained nurses, subject to the orders of the Relief Committee; there will be a sinking fund to be applied in helping every one who has an extra burden, such as his own sickness or that of some member of his family, and this not as a matter of charity, but of love; there will be a savings bank, and possibly a life insurance department. In short, wherever men think and feel and suffer and need, there the church will be also, to help.

No hymn-books will be used in that church; no announcements will be made from the pulpit. Printed programmes containing all these matters, and many others, will be found in the seats, or be handed each attendant by the ushers.

The programme for the week will read something like this:

Monday—Mothers' Meeting, 3 P. M., Room D; Official Board, 8 P. M., Room G; Sunday-school Teachers, 7 to 8 P. M., Room I.

Gymnasium, Reading-Room, Reception Room, Dispensary, open every day throughout the week.

Tuesday—Sewing Class, 9 A. M., Room D; Chautauqua Class, 8 P. M., Room G; Knights of Labor Lecture, 8 P. M., Room B; Ladies' Relief Corps, 7 to 8 P. M., Room I; Pastor's Weekly Reception, Pastor's Room, 7 to 10 P. M.

Wednesday—Free Scientific Lecture, 8 P. M., Room B, etc.

Thus, I would scatter through the week, the forty or fifty different meetings, scheduling them so that while two or three would be held at the same hour, there would yet really be little conflict.

I would have the platform of Room B open to the discussion of every legitimate question—politics, scientific matters, literature, art, sociology—and I would call to that platform every one who could interest and instruct the people, maintaining a lecture course of the best obtainable talent, at the lowest possible cost, and having all neighboring talent give their best thoughts free of cost. I would make that platform so broad, liberal and prominent, that to be invited to it would be an honor.

The Lord's day meetings conducted by the pastor and his assistants would be an ennobling service. The pastor of my twentieth century church never has the dyspepsia, and consequently never scolds, but, with a heart full of love to God and man, he always helps